

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REASSESSMENT OF
THE CLASSICAL PERIOD IN CENTRAL ASIA MINOR

Submitted to the University of Edinburgh
for the Degree of Ph.D.,

by

M.H.Ballance.

1960



CONTENTS

	Page	Inscriptions
Introduction	iv	
Phrygia Pacatiana		
The Upper Plain of the Maeander	1	1-13
Sebaste and the Southern Banaz Ova	14	14-34
Akmonia and the Northern Banaz Ova	31	35-75
The Moxeanoi	58	76-78
Kidyessos and Aristion	63	79-94
The Lykaones	74	-
Pepouza	74	-
Phrygia Salutaris		
The Pentapolis	76	95-116
Prymnessos	104	117-118
Ayaz Ini; the Church	108	-
Synnada	112	119-135
Pisidia		
Apameia and Kelainai	120	136
Apollonia and Tymandos	132	137-152
Galatia Salutaris		
The Area of Amorion	146	153-164
Lykaonia and Tyanitis		
Geography	154	
Ancient Roads in Lykaonia	157	
Ikonion and the Ikonian Plain	180	165-172
Fakra Dağ	189	-
The Northern Boz Dağ	190	173-188
Perta and Central Boz Dağ	201	189-215

	Page	Inscriptions
Savatra and Kana	218	216-228
The Plains South of Lake Tatta	226	229-233
Hyde	230	-
Sidamaria	232	234-243
Derbe	238	244-245
Barata	242	246-247
Laranda, Ilistra, Posala and Kodylessos	246	248-253
The Ibrala Valley	250	-
Dalisandos, Korna and Nea Isaura	257	-
Cappadocia Secunda		
The South Side of Hasan Dağı	258	254
Abbreviations	264	

INTRODUCTION

The study of the archaeology and topography of the Central Anatolian Plateau has been subject to great fluctuations in interest and emphasis. It was begun, to all intents and purposes, by Leake, Hamilton Texier and Arundell in the first half of the last century. Interest then waned somewhat until Ramsay, in the early eighties, took up the subject with an enthusiasm and brilliance that made him within ten years the almost undisputed authority on the topography and epigraphy of the Plateau. After Ramsay's retirement from active field-work the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor began the programme of work that resulted in the publication of *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. The emphasis, in this series, was primarily epigraphical, and although points of topography arising from individual inscriptions were faithfully dealt with, no general revision of Ramsay's topographical scheme was attempted. The value of the seven volumes of MAMA, so far published, lies in their consolidation of so much of the basic material on which future topographical and epigraphical studies will have to be based and in the standards of accuracy and objectivity that they have laid down.

Archaeology in the more general sense, the study of the ancient inhabitants of an area from the material remains of their civilisation, has made less progress on the Anatolian Plateau than in most other areas of western Asia simply because there has been no excavation to speak of and the material remains

visible above ground are limited both in variety and quality. The number of standing pre-Byzantine buildings in the Central Plains is very small. It includes the temples at Ankyra and Aizanoi, aqueducts at Antiocheia and Tyana and the badly-damaged remains of a few theatres. Sixteen hundred years of Byzantine and Turkish stone-robbing have resulted in the destruction of everything else, except in mountainous areas such as Pisidia and Cilicia Tracheia, where the population has been much reduced in numbers since the Roman period. But if the monuments are few on the ground, publications concerning them are even more meagre. Excavation and architectural survey work has been confined, for practical purposes, to Aizanoi and Ankyra. Antiocheia was partly excavated by Ramsay and Robinson many years ago, but the results have never been ^{fully} published.

Byzantine buildings are far more numerous than Roman ones, and far more of them have been published. The pioneering work of Crowfoot and Smirnov, which formed the basis of Strzygowski's Kleinasien, was followed by Rott's Kleinasiatische Denkmäler, Ramsay and Bell's Thousand and one Churches, and de Jerphanion's monumental Eglises Rupestres. But the almost complete lack of internal evidence for the dating of these churches still remains to be made good, and this will, in the end, involve a good deal of excavation of the most meticulous kind, a process which has as yet only just begun. Until it has been carried much further, a balanced judgement of the importance of Anatolian church-architecture and of its effects on Byzantine art as a whole cannot be attempted.

Our knowledge of the Classical archaeology of Central Asia Minor is now at a point where it would be possible to compile, without further field-work, a very bulky corpus of its inscriptions, a map showing the majority of its cities, some of its villages, and the greater part of its Roman road-system, and lastly a fairly comprehensive general work on its churches. From inscriptions we know a good deal about its social anthropology, its provincial and municipal administration, and its religion. Of the daily life of its inhabitants, we know nothing except from literary sources, from the reliefs on their gravestones and to some extent from the study of the village life of the present-day Turks, who, although differing from their predecessors in religion and to a large extent in social origin, have inherited from them many of their traditional crafts in building and agriculture.

It is inevitable in any subject that the emphasis laid on it depends largely on the nature of the evidence. The earlier nineteenth century travellers had in many ways a more balanced view of the archaeology of Central Anatolia than we can have now, simply because the remains of antiquity that they saw around them were better preserved and more varied. They identified ancient sites by the ruins of buildings upon them, as one can still do today in Syria or the more mountainous parts of Turkey. Most of these ruined buildings have since been removed to provide material for Turkish houses, and today the best indication of an important ancient site is the presence of inscriptions in a modern village. As a result, almost all the work done on the subject in the last years has had an epigraphical bias. In another

hundred years the number of inscriptions will have been much reduced and we shall fall back more and more on excavation and the study of pottery, neither of which has yet been seriously attempted on the Plateau, so far as the Classical period is concerned.

In this volume I have attempted to maintain a balance between the three points of view, architectural history, epigraphy and what, for want of a better term, is often called field archaeology.

My introduction to the Plateau came in 1954, when I accompanied Professor Calder on epigraphical journeys to the Upper Maeander Valley, the area between Amorion and Boz Dağ, and Sidamaria. From 1955 to 1957 a grant from the Tweedie Fund and a Treasury ("Scarborough") Senior Studentship, enabled me to travel extensively over the whole area from the headwaters of the Maeander to the Cilician Gates, recording a total of nearly 500 inscriptions as well as a number of churches and other monuments. Rather more than half of this material is reproduced here.

My thanks are due to the Tweedie Committee and HM Treasury, who provided the funds, to the University of Edinburgh for the use of its Land Rover, to the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara for its hospitality and assistance over the practical difficulties of travelling in Turkey, to Mr. Gough for his help and advice throughout, to Miss Joyce Reynolds for advice on the Latin inscriptions, to those at the British School at Rome who helped to put this thesis into its final shape, and most of all to the late Sir William Calder, who suggested the project in the first place and gave me the full benefit of his great experience towards carrying it out.

PHRYGIA PACATIANA

The Upper Plain of the Maeander

From Apameia, the modern Dinar (pp. 120ff), the Maeander flows in a generally NW direction for some 8 km. before passing through a narrow defile, between the modern villages of Seydimelek and Kabaklı. This defile forms the natural boundary between the small plain of Apameia and the much larger and more fertile alluvial valley that Pliny (NH v, 113) calls the regio ... Eumenetica, after Eumeneia, the most important, in Roman times, of the cities among which it was divided. Beyond Eumeneia, which lies at the N corner of the plain, some 35 km. NW of Apameia, the valley makes a right-angled bend and continues in a SW direction for a further 45 km. to Lounda, where the Maeander drops into a deep gorge. It is from 10 to 15 km. wide throughout its length, with a flat floor across which the Maeander wanders with its proverbial lack of decision.

Eumeneia, a Pergamene colony and a city of considerable wealth in Roman times, though it decayed rapidly in the fourth century, lay at the modern Işıklı, a pleasant, well-watered situation of no military strength, on the road from the Pentapolis to Apameia and Hierapolis. Behind the city, on the N and E, the mountains close in rapidly, culminating in the formidable massifs of Ak Dağ and Burgaz Dağı, divided from each other only by the narrow valley of the Kufi Çay, down which the road must have passed.

The only ancient building of which any traces remain in situ is the garrison barracks, a square about 105 x 105 m., with

walls of mortared rubble at least 2 m. thick. Only fragments of the walls survive and there is no trace of the gates. The ditch, which appears to have been separated from the wall by a pronounced berm, can be traced at some points, though the surrounding ground has, as is normal on the outskirts of a Turkish village, been disturbed a good deal. This is presumably the castra restored by Severus in 196 after an earthquake (MAMA iv, no. 328). Its small size suggests that it was built to house a cohors quingenaria⁽¹⁾.

To the SE of Eumeneia the plain is cut in two by a great marsh formed by the spring that pours out of the hill behind the city⁽²⁾. This may have been of smaller extent in ancient times, but must always have formed a definite division between the plain of Eumeneia proper and that of Sibilis (below).

Attanassos, known as a bishopric from the 5th century, may have been in the area of Eumeneia. Ramsay's theory (CB i, pp. 241 ff.) that it was at Dedeköy, a now deserted village with an old mosque near the modern Haydan (Aidan), seems to be based entirely on the very slight resemblance in name between Attanassos and Aidan, and on the assumption that Attanassos, being obviously pre-Greek in name, was the site of the hieron of Apollo Propylaios, who, as is shown by reliefs on dedications to him, was a local Anatolian god. There is enough Roman pottery at Dedeköy to prove that it was an ancient site, but such evidence as there is tends to put the hieron of Apollo Propylaios at Koçak, 4 km. NW of Dedeköy (below, no. 2).

Hierocles appears to be practically valueless, in this area, as an indication of position, and the site of Attanassos must,

until more positive evidence becomes available, remain completely uncertain.

Peltai, already an important place in Xenophon's time, received a Seleucid colony (HN(2), p. 682), later fell under the shadow of its Pergamene rival, recovered sufficiently to issue coins in the 2nd century A.D. (ibid) and finally emerges as a bishopric (CB i, p.249).

The only precise evidence for its position is in Xenophon (Anab. I,2,10 ff.), who puts it 10 parasangs from Kelainai and 12 from Keramon Agora, and in the Peutinger Table, which marks Pella on a road from Eumeneia to a junction with a road Hierapolis-Apameia⁽³⁾. The distance from Apameia appears to be given as 26 m.p., which suits a position near Seraserli, where the modern road and railway from Dinar to Çivril cross the Maeander. A mound is marked on the map and would be worth investigation. Ramsay's two sites between Melhoğ and Karayahşiler (JHS iv, 1883, p. 398; CB i, p. 240) are also possible, though they fit the Table's distances less well. The road from Eumeneia to Apameia given in the Table presumably kept to the W of the Eumeneian marshes, rather than following the steep and stony route along the hillside past Homa. The Table's station ad Vicum should probably be looked for near Tekkeköy or Irgıllı.

Lounda. This city is known only from Hierocles (667), from ecclesiastical sources (CB i, pp. 237 ff.) and from an inscription (JHS iv, 1883, p.395, no. 15; CB i, no. 84), where the initial letter is missing from the ethnic but there can be no reasonable doubt as to its restoration. The site was near the bend of the Maeander some 40 km. SW of Eumeneia; for the

purpose of the present study, Lounda is of interest only as giving some idea of the extent of the territory of Peltai on the SW.

Siblia. The evidence for putting Siblia in the plain of the Maeander, up-stream from the Eumeneian marshes, is strong (CB i, pp. 221 ff.). Anderson's inscription (JHS xviii, 1898, pp. 93 f., no.32) mentioning the $\Sigma, \beta \lambda \iota \alpha \nu \sigma \iota$, was found built into the platform at Evciler station and may have come from some distance. But while it does not necessarily prove that Siblia was at Evciler, the possibility remains, since Evciler was certainly an ancient site (CB i, p. 227). Ramsay's location of the Byzantine Lampe at Evciler (ibid) or at Appa (CB i, p. 347) is based on slender evidence. An alternative site for Siblia is Sütlaç Hüyük, where there is a large, partly natural mound covered with Roman occupation debris, while in the surrounding fields columns and sarcophagi are said to have been dug up. This does not affect the location of the Byzantine Soublaion at Homa, which, although uncertain (RE s.v. Siblia) seems quite possible in view of the nature of the site.

NOTES

(1) R.G. Collingwood Archaeology of Roman Britain, London 1930, pp. 24 f. on the size of cohort forts, gives 2-3 acres usable space for a cohors quingenaria and 4-5 for a cohors milliaria (more if equitata). Cohors I Raetorum which was probably the first occupant of the Severan fort, was equitata but probably not milliaria (E. Ritterling, JRS xvii, 1927, p. 31; RE iv, col. 326) The usable area of the Eumenia fort is approximately 2½ acres, which is perhaps a little cramped for a cohors equitata. But virtually nothing is known of cohort forts in Asia Minor.

(2) Identified by Ramsay (CB ii, p. 354) as the Cludrus of Pliny. Radet (Studies Ramsay pp. 315 ff.) has attempted to transfer both the Cludrus and the Glaucus (identified by Ramsay with the Kufi Çay) to another Eumeneia in Caria, recorded only by Stephanus Byzantinus; he defeats his own argument by admitting that the known Eumeneian coins, presumably including those with the type of the river-god Glaukos (BMC Phrygia p. 214), are to be assigned to the Phrygian city. Photographs of the spring MAMA iv, pls. 10-11.

(3) Ptolemy (V,2, 17-18) vaguely indicates a position either in this plain or in the Pentapolis for the Peltenoi; the order of Hierocles (667) puts *Μολτη* between Lounda and Eumenia.

Upper Maeander Valley

Inscriptions

1. KAVAK, in a well-head. White marble block, broken above, right, below and behind, later reused as the winch-stone of a wine-press.

H. 58 plus, w. 64 plus, th. 61 plus, lett. 3.5. Pls. ₁ , P₁ .

? [πρ]αξων [-] Α [-] Κ [- - - c. 8 - - -]
 ? [ἡγε]μονικων προς [τους]?
 [?] πολειτας αὐτῆς [- - - - -]
 ? [μ]η στρατευεσθα [ι πεισ-]?
 5. αὐτα ἡ Βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος.

The figures on the right indicate the smallest number of letters likely to have been lost.

The historical setting is most uncertain. Possibly an incident in the war between Septimius Severus and Pescennius Niger. The lettering suits that date (cf. no. 97). The inscription is likely to belong to Peltai rather than to Eumeneia.

2. KOÇAK, in a house; said to have been found by children on the hill above the village. Marble stele, broken in three pieces, but not recently. H. 44, w. 18.5, 15-16, 19.5, th. 5-6.5, lett. 1.5 - 2.6. In the pediment, circular boss; on the shaft, double axe and snake in relief. Pls. 1 , P₁ .

Εὐτυχος
 Ἀπολ[λ]
 ωνι [πρ]
 πυλδιω
 5. εὐχ[ήν].

This is the fifth epigraphic mention of Apollo Propylaios at Eumeneia. The others are CB ii, no. 195 (dedication from Koçak), ibid. no. 196 (a priest of the god, from Işıklı), ABSA xi, 1904-5, pp. 28 f., no. 1 (dedication from Işıklı), JRS xvi, 1926, p. 66, no. 187 (dedication from Balçikhisar). The discovery of a second dedication at Koçak suggests that the sanctuary of the god should be sought there rather than at Haydan (above, p. 2).

3. SERBANŞAH (Savransah), in the foundation of a wall. Plain whitish limestone bomos, buried above. H. 93 plus, w. 47, 35, 47, th. -, -, 47, lett. 2.2 - 3.0. Pl. 1 .

Τροφίμος 'Ιουλίδας
'Ιουλινῆς οἰκονο-
μος ἐποίησεν ἐ-
αὐτῷ συν καὶ Σε-
5. ου(η)ρα Λο[νγ]εινῶν-
<ς> τῇ γυναι[ι]κι αὐτοῦ
κυνωνησάσιν κα-
τα το ἐπιβέλλον
αὐτὴν τῆς δαπν-

10. νης vac

11. 7 & 9, ν used instead of η.

1.8 λ used instead of α.

There is a tendency for οἰκονομοί, some at least of whom were presumably of servile origin, to give the names of their employers rather than their patronymics (below, no. 237).

4. TUĞCU ÇİFTLİĞİ, outside a house. Bomos of whitish crystalline

marble, buried below, probably cut off above. H. 64 plus, w. 43, 34-35, -, th. 44, 34-35, -, lett. 1.5 - 2.0. A lion-head in relief on each corner, connected by garlands and ribbons. From the centre of each garland hangs a bunch of grapes, except on the front, where it is replaced by a tabula containing ll. 6-12 of the inscription. Above the centre of each garland a figure in relief; on the front an eagle; on the left, defaced relief; on the right, female bust; on the back, not visible. Pl. P1.

[ὁ δεινὸς κατέσκειν-]
 [ἄσεν τὸ συνκρούστων] underlined letters from CB.
 συν τῷ βωμῷ ἔδν-
 [τῷ καὶ] τῇ γυνδικὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀρ[ι][σ]τ[ο]τ[έ]λης
 5. τῇ καὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐ-
 <αὐ>τῶν
 Ἀριστῇ καὶ Ἀπφίῳ (sic)
 τῇ πατρὶ τῇ Ἀρισ-
 τῆς ἑτέρῳ δε σὺ-
 10. δένη ἐξέσται τε-
 θηνδὶ ὅς δε αὐ ἔ-
 πιχειρήσει ἀπο-
 τείσει τῷ φίσκῳ
 On the right side, level with l.10,
 Θυρᾶ

l.12 The amount of the fine does not appear either on the rim of the tabula or immediately below it.

Published CB ii, no. 272.

5. KOÇAK, in a yard, where it was in use as a dibek tasi; said to have been brought from Isiklî. Whitish crystalline marble block,

broken right. H. 82, w. 59 plus, th. 65, lett. 4 - 7. Pl. # .

C. Aruntius C.[f.]

Vel(ina) Arabus

Sitae Leiber[fo]

Ἀρῦβος Σείτα ἀπέχε[υθερω]

5. θεοῖς ἡρώσι ἱερο[v]

d]eis Manibu[s]

sacrum

11. 3-4 Sita or Sitas was probably a Moesian or Thracian; cf. RE s.v. Sita, Sitas, Sittas, and B. Beshevleev, Epigraphic Studies, Sophia 1952 (in Bulgarian), no. 91, the epitaph of Mucatral(is) Site f(ilius) natio(ne) B(essus) m(iles) c(o)h(ortis) ii F(laviae) B(rittonum).

6. YUVA KÖYÜ, in the wall of the mosque garden; formerly in a cemetery between Yuva Köyü and Kayacik. Greyish-white marble block with inscription in panel. Broken above, buried at one side. H. 53 plus (panel 48 plus), w. 108 plus (panel 90), th. 33, lett 2.1 - 2.8. Pl. 1 .

- Π. Αἴλιος Πάυλεινος Εὐμένεος βουλευτῆς τὸν βωμόν
καὶ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ σαρ(ο)ν κα(τ)εσκευάσεν τῷ τε ἀδε(λ)φῷ
αὐτοῦ Αἰλ. Τερτυλλῷ τῷ κεκηδευμένῳ καὶ ἐαυ-
τῷ Ἰων καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ Αὐρ. Τατίᾳ Ἰώση[εἰ]ς ἢ
5. οὐδεν[ι] ἑτέρῳ ἐξεστὶ τεθῆναι ὅς δ[ε] το[υ] μ[η]-
ση ἐτ[ερον] θείναι εἰσοίσει προστείμο[ν εἰς] τὴν
βουλήν] * α'. ὁμοίως κατεσκευάσεν [καὶ ὑπὸ
τοῦ βωμοῦ συνκρουσθᾶ δυοῖν εἰς τὸ ἐτ[ερον]
κεκηδευτὰ ὁ π[α]τήρ αὐτοῦ Αἰλ. Νόστος τῶν
10. δε συνκρουστων ἐξουσίδαν ἐξουσιν οἱ υἱ-
οι τοῦ Πάυλεινου Αἴλιοι Νόστος καὶ Πάυλεινος

7. YALINLI, by a well in the village. Marble bomos, re-cut as a Byzantine capital. H. 81, w. 27, th. 29, lett. 1.3 - 2.5. On the front, signs of defaced upper mouldings and circular relief.

Pl. 1 .

?[ΔΙ]ΟΥ Ἀρτῶ Διωνί κα[ι]

τοῖς προκειμε-

νοῖς

τε

κνοῖς

5. Μ Relief ου

Δ ιο-

υυ εἰ-

αὐ καὶ τῶ-

τιδι

10. [μνοῖς] ἑτέρω

[δε οὐδεν] εἰ ἔξεσ-

[τῶ θείν] αὐ ὅς δε

[ἐπιχει]ρήσει θ-

[ήσει προσ]ειμὸν ἰς

15. [το τῶ μείον * φ']

On the back of the stone, monogram.

Θυρα

Restorations exempli gratia.

8. SERBANSÄH (Savransah), in the wall of a house behind the mosque. Marble altar, broken right, cracked across, upper

moulding cut away. H. 111, w. 34 plus, th. -, lett. 2 - 2.3.
At the corners, lion's heads, connected by swags and ribbons.
On the front, above the swag, a whorl. Pl. P1 .

- [- - - - -]
 ἑαυτῷ το ἥρωον [κατεσκεύ-]
 ασεν καὶ τῇ γυναι [ικὶ αὐτοῦ]
 τὰτι α [καὶ]
 5. τῇ whorl π [εν]
 θερά Ιουλι [α]
 καὶ τοῖς τέκνοι [ἰς αὐτῶν]
 τοῦ ἰς ὁ ἑτέρω [οὐκ]
 ἔξεσται κη [θενσάι]
 10. χωρὶς τῶν χ [εγγραμ-]
 μένων εἰ [δε μὴ ὅς]
 αὐτὸν ἐπιχειρ [ήσῃ θη-]
 σῇ ἰς τὸν ἰε [ρον]
 φίσκον * α
 15. vac καὶ σὺ [θάνει]?]

9. KIZILCA SÜĞÜT, by the mosque. Grey limestone bomos, broken
above and below. H. 83 plus, w. -, 46-49, -, th. -, 32-36, -,
lett. 3.5 - 4.0. Pl. 3 .

- Ἀπολλωνιος
 Μενάνδρου
 Σκυλάκι πᾶπ-
 πω μνημῆς
 5. ἐνεκεν.

10. BOZHÜYÜK, in the wall of a house. White limestone fragment with tabula ansata, broken on all sides. H. 40 plus, w. 58 plus, th. -, lett. 3.1 - 3.4. Pl. 1 .

Αὐρ. Αὐξανων Διοδωρ[ου ἐποίη-]
 εδ το ἥρων ἐδύτω κα[ι τῇ γυνε-]
 κι αὐτου Αὐρ. Ἀρριδ

11. YALINLI, in a house wall at the N end of the village. Grey marble block, probably complete. H. 54, w. 32, th. 25, lett. 1.7 - 2.0. pl. 3 .

Ἀνδρεινος κατε-
 κενδσεν το ἥρω-
 ον ἐδύτω καὶ τῇ σ-
 υνεκι αὐτου καὶ το-

5. 15 ΤΕΚΝΟΙΣ Αὐτου ἐ-
 ι τι(ς) δε ἑτερος ἐπιχ-
 ειρησει θειγε τινα
 εστε αὐτω προσ τ-
 ον Θεον.

11. 3-4 There has been some confusion between συνβιος and γυνη

12. ÇÜPLÜ (now renamed Şenköy), in the Dede by the mosque. Greyish-white crystalline marble bomos, buried below. H. 42 plus, w. 23, 19, -, th. 25, 20, -, lett. 2-4. Above the inscription, defaced relief (cross?). Pl. 1 .

ΥΠΑΤΙΟΥ
 ΕΥ-
 ΣΗΜΟ-
 VOS.

13. SÖKMEN, in a yard. Shaped block of yellow limestone, broken above, left, right and behind. H. 46 plus, w. 51 plus, th. 52, lett. 4.2 - 7.5. Pl. 3 .

No transcription is attempted. The stone is rough, but the letters are well preserved.

Sebaste and the Southern Banaz Ova

The Augustan foundation or re-foundation of Sebaste (RE s.v. Sebaste, 1) lay in the region of Selcikler, about 2.5 km. W of the kaza of Sivaslı, which preserves the ancient name. There is no evidence of its having been inhabited in pre-Roman times, except for two large tumuli on the S side of the village of Selcikler, and probably the tomb described below.

It would seem that, contrary to the view expressed in CB (ii, p. 581), the site of Sivaslı was not included in the city proper. Since 1897 no new inscriptions appear to have been discovered at Sivaslı (except no. 17), whereas the number known from Selcikler has been more than doubled. This is not likely to be entirely accidental, since four of the inscriptions given in CB from Sivaslı were still visible in 1956. The remains on the ground confirm this conclusion.

Selcikler still has remains of at least two ancient buildings. One, about 50 m. S of the mosque, is probably of Byzantine date and appears from the solidity of its construction, in stone and odd pieces of tile, to have been of some size. There is no sign of its purpose, but it may well have been a church.

A little way south of the village, between the two large tumuli, there are remains of a tomb, with some indications that it also was covered by a small tumulus (pl. P1, A). It is built of very heavy limestone blocks, accurately jointed. The two slabs forming the gabled roof were originally about 3.20 m. long,

2,20^{m.} wide, and 45 cm. thick. It is unlikely to be as late as the Roman period, but appears to be derived from the Phrygian timber chamber tombs exemplified by the royal tombs at Gordium. But the persistence of pre-Roman types of tomb into the Roman period is well attested elsewhere, and the possibility of a similar survival at Sebaste cannot be entirely discounted ⁽¹⁾.

A cistern, presumably of some size, is mentioned in inscription no. 14. There is now no sign of the aqueduct that must have fed it.

Villages dependent on Sebaste. The evidence for placing Leonna or Leonnaia, which issued coins in the second century B.C., in the territory of the later Sebaste, is slight, though the inscriptions from Payamalan seem to support Ramsay's contention that a city of some sort lay there ⁽²⁾. On a brief visit in 1954, Professor Calder and I found nothing further of interest except a number of carved slabs from a Byzantine church.

Dioskome appears to have been either at Kapaklar (Tabaklar), where inscription no. 15 was found, or at the nearby Kırka. Both are ancient sites, but to judge from the number of stones visible and from local information, Kırka was probably the more important ⁽³⁾. Both are surprisingly far north to have been included in the territory of Sebaste, and it remains a possibility that the stone has been carried from elsewhere.

Babdalai is known only from a single dedication (no. 16). There are said to be remains of an ancient settlement between Samatlar and Erice Çiftlik, which may represent its site.

Tyraxa, inferred from a dedication Μητρι Τυραξηνῃ (JRS xvi, 1926, p. 94, no. 228; SEG vi, no. 190) and another village

mentioned in an inscription at Tatar Köyü (JRS xvi, p. 88, no. 218; SEG vi, no. 178) may have been little more than suburbs of Sebaste. Alternatively, one or other may have been at the "Hendek", regarded by Anderson as the site of Bria (below).

No attempt has been made, in giving the texts of inscriptions, to differentiate between Sebaste and the other cities and villages of the Southern Banaz Ova. The northern boundary of the territory of Sebaste has been arbitrarily fixed to include Kapaklar, Kırka and Erice, but not Kızılcı Söğüt.

Bria. The location of this city remains in doubt. Hierocles' order puts it between Pepouza and Sebaste, which is hardly sufficient reason for locating it in this plain at all, so long as Pepouza remains uncertain (pp. 74 f.); the few coins of the Severan period with the legend $\Sigma\text{Ρ}\text{ΙΑ}\text{Ν}\text{Ω}\text{Ν}$ are little help. The identification with the modern Burgaz (Bulkaz), proposed by Ramsay and independently by Radet, rests on a similarity of name. Anderson accepted Burgaz as the modern successor of Bria and discovered a possible site for it at "Hendek" ("the ditch"), 3 km. NW of Burgaz and 3 km. SE of Tatar⁽⁴⁾. "Hendek", in its final form at least, is a "village fort" of Byzantine date, though Anderson adds that the surrounding ground also showed signs of ancient occupation, a point which I may not have investigated sufficiently thoroughly, not having seen Anderson's description before visiting the site.

The line of the main wall of the fort (pls. 2, P1, 3), which enclosed an area of about 180 x 205 m., is visible except at the NW corner, though in most places it appears only as a ridge of earth with large blocks of stone, mainly reused, protruding

through the grass at intervals. There are traces of at least five small towers, apparently semicircular and without back walls. A shallow ditch runs round most of the circuit, but is replaced on the W side by two small scarps parallel to the wall. On the W half of the N side there was probably only one scarp. Both the scarps and the inner edge of the ditch were revetted with stone; there is nothing to show whether the revetments were carried up above the level of the berm, to form a small wall or breastwork, as it certainly was, not only in the fortifications of the larger Byzantine cities, but also in some smaller forts⁽⁵⁾. There is no obvious reason why the ditch should have been cut in some parts and not others; the surrounding country is flat, and an attack on the fort could have been made equally well from any direction. Possibly the W and NW sides, which have no ditch and are less regular in plan, represent a later addition.

The interior of the fort is littered with rubble from buildings, and a depression near the NW corner marks the spot from which blocks and some red marble columns are said to have been removed.

The pottery is consistent with a date between the 4th and 7th centuries A.D., which suits the style of fortification well. For other early Byzantine village forts, see pp. 202, 239 f.

There is also an extensive ancient site at the foot of Burgaz Dağı, 2 km. S of Cabar and 6 km. SE of Burgaz. It is about 400 m. in diameter, but it is always difficult in such cases to determine without excavation how much of the area was occupied by buildings and how much of the immense quantity of

rubble lying on the surface comes in fact from the walls of gardens and yards. Here some of the better walls had massive stone orthostats at intervals, a system of construction often found in late Roman and Byzantine sites in Asia Minor, for instance at Madengehir in Lykaonia, where the lines of orthostats with their tops just projecting from the ground, can still be followed at some points on the outskirts of the modern village⁽⁶⁾. The site at Cabar is certainly Byzantine in its present form, but it has never been ploughed and may well conceal earlier remains.

Alydda-Elouza. The identification of the Ilouza of Hierocles (the Elouza of the Notitiae) with the Alydda of Ptolemy and the Aludda of the Peutinger Table (RE s.vv. Alydda, Iluza) is reasonable. Ramsay's location of it at Hadjimler (which, like Honigmann on Hierocles⁶⁶⁷, I assume to be the Hocalar of the Turkish map 10 km. ESE of Uşak) is supported by the Table's distance of 25 m.p. from Akmonia.

Other sites in the S Banaz Ova. At Piyanlı, between Erice and the gorge of the Banaz Cay, there are remains of a church, with signs of Roman and Byzantine settlement round it. The church (pl. 4) was of some size, about 27 by 12 paces. In the summer of 1956 it was being energetically robbed out, the apse had already been removed, and part of the east wall had been uncovered but not destroyed. The S and W walls were approximately marked by ridges of broken stones lying on the surface; of the N side there was no sign. The walls were of rough stone and mortar, though the apse may have been of dressed stone. A Montanist gravestone (no. 31) was among the stones removed from it. The floor was of marble slabs, 5 cm. thick.

Sebaste and the Southern Banaz Ova

NOTES

- (1) Gordium, AJA lxii, 1958, pp. 147 ff., pls. 23 ff. At Pergamon, tombs of pre-Greek type were still being built in the Roman period (Pergamon i, Text, 2, pp. 243 ff.). In Lykaonia, Roman tumuli with stone-built chambers are not uncommon (AS, viii, p. 227), while two tombs at Degile (1001 Churches, pp. 236 ff.) which can hardly be pre-Roman, are poor examples of the Selcikler type.
- (2) CB ii, pp. 597 f. and no. 499; in reply to this, Rev. Univ. Thid, 1896, p. 288; RE s.v. Leonna.
- (3) CB ii, p. 583; Aus Lydien, p. 169.
- (4) Hierocles 667; BMC Phrygia, pp. xli, 109; CB ii, pp. 576 ff. J.G.C. Anderson in JHS xvii, 1897, pp. 415 ff.
- (5) At Emporiò on Chios, the small Byzantine fort (dated securely about 600), had a similar revetted scarp or outer breastwork (JHS lxxiv, 1954, p. 163). At Dakibyza (Gevze) in Bithynia, a more ambitious castle of similar or rather later date, the breastwork still stands to practically its original height (personal observation; the two publications mentioned in Bibliyografiya p. 136 are not available to me).
- (6) Also around the Maeander gorge, personal observation. The same system of construction is common in parts of Tripolitania.

Sebaste and South Banaz Ova

Inscriptions

14. SIVASLI in a street, from a recently demolished fountain. Cornice of greyish-white crystalline marble. H. 30, w. 116, th. 71, lett. 5. The front and right hand end have decorated mouldings. The inscription must have begun on another block to the left, and have been continued either on another side of the building or on the architrave^{or} frieze. Pl. P1.

[ἡ Σεβαστην]ων πόλις το ὑδρεῖον ἐκ τῶν ἰ-
[δίων κτλ.]

Published CB ii, no. 483; K.Kourouniotes 'Ἡμερολόγιον τῆς Μεγάλης Ἑλλάδος', 1925, p. 407; thence BCH xlviii, 1924, p. 511, and SEG vi, no. 181.

15. KAPAKLAR (Tabaklar), in the base of the minaret. Bomos of coarse whitish marble, upper and lower mouldings cut off, chipped left. H. 110, w. --, 47, --, th. --, 44, --, lett. 1.6 - 2.1. Pl. 3.

Ἀντοκράτορι [Καίσαρι]
[Μ. 'Ιουλιῷ Φιλίππῳ]
[Γερμανικῷ καὶ τῷ συμ-]
παντί οἴκῳ τῶν Σεβαστῶν
5 [ἐ]τους τλ' μ. [η(νος)] δεκάτου ἡ
Διοσκωμή[τῶν] κατοικιδ
[τῆς] λαμπροτάτης Σεβασ[τῆς]
[τῆς] ἡνῶν πόλεως ἐκ τῶν
[ἰ]δίων πορ[τῶν] το ἔργον κα[τ]
10 εσκεν[α]σε[ν] ἐπιμελησα-
μένων Α. [Ἐγν]ατίου Γλυκ[ω-]
[ν]ιδίου [.....] καὶ Ποπλ[ι-]

ου ΠΕΤΡΩ[νίου] Γ[α]ίου κδι Λ[ου]-
 κίου Ἐχιδτίου Λονγού κδι[ι]
 15 Γ[α]ίου Ἐχιδτίου Π[α]ιδίου κδι[ι]
 Γ[α]ίου Ἐχιδτίου Κλωσίδ-
 νου κδι vac? vac?
 ΓΟΥ Σεβαστήνου

The letters were never deeply cut, and the stone has decayed in a most unusual way, apparently due to a moss or alga that has caused pitting. In many cases this pitting follows and even accentuates the lines of the letters. The drawing attempts to convey this effect by closely spaced dots. Ramsay's hand copy is a very creditable rendering of the text, but omits the last word of 1.18 and can be corrected at several points.

11. 1-3, Ancient erasure.

1.6 Dioskome, see p. 15 .

1.9 The γ of the word restored as ἔργον is practically certain.

1.12 Ramsay has ^τΙΑ as the last three letters, ΠΛ is more likely

1.13 Ramsay's ΠΕΤΡΩ[νίου] is too short to fill the gap. Γ[α]ίου might be either a patronymic or a cognomen; cf. IGR iii, no. 412.

1.16 The first word is very obscure. Ramsay's [?]ιδνοῦ is understandable. The third letter appears at first sight to be N, but the oblique stroke is probably a natural crack in the stone. A praenomen is required at this point, and Γ[α]ίου (or Τε[ι]του) is the most likely.

11. 17-18 The end of 1.17 was never engraved, and the same

may be true of the middle, though the stone at this point is very badly pitted. Ramsay suggested [Λόν]γου but the syntax is quite uncertain. Σεβαστηνῶν would have been expected but is not on the stone. Σεβαστηνοῦ is a possible reading.

Published JHS iv, 1883, p. 415, no. 29; thence CB ii, no. 498, IGR iv, no. 635.

16. Between SAMATLAR and CIFTLIK, in a fountain (Geycek Cesmesi). White crystalline marble bomos. H. 85, w. 58, 50-52, 59, th. 42, 33-35, -, lett. 2.5-3.0. Pl. 4.

Διονυσίου Μην-
 α εὐχάμ-
 ενος ἀνεθῆ-
 κεν βωμόν τῷ Δι(ι)
 5 καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦ-
 σιν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι
 Σ vac.

The text is certain; for the formula of dedication to a god and a community, cf. JHS xxxi, 1911, p. 186, no. 48, τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις θεοῖς καὶ τῇ κώμῃ.

17. SIVASLI, in a house. Marble stele with pediment above and tenon below. H. 43, w. 33, 30, 34, th. 8, lett. 1.0-2.2. On the shaft, relief of a human leg. Pl. 4.

Αὐτ. Ἀπταλος ἐγ μεγαλῆς
 νοσοῦ σωθεὶς εὐχαριστ-
 ῶ Μητρὶ Λητῷ καὶ
 Νεμεσῶνι ἱ. προκα-
 5 θημέν rel. αὐτὸς καὶ ἱ-
ief. ερὰς Ν rel. νεφάς

1.4 The two Nemeseis of Smyrna (RE xvi, 2, cols. 2352 f.), who are represented on coins as far east as Kadoi and Synaos (HN (2) pp. 668, 685).

1.6 Perhaps the nymphs of the fountain at Pınarbaşı, a little to the south of Sivaslı.

18. SELCIKLER, in the wall of the mosque garden. Greyish-white crystalline marble architrave, broken left, upper moulding defaced. H. 34, w. 79 plus, th. -, lett. (1.1) 5.0-5.5, (1.2) 4.5 Pl. 3 .

]os leaf ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ἱ[δίων

]v leaf. vac.

19. KIRKA, in a fountain (Kavaklı Çeşme) 1 km. SSE of the village. White marble doorstone, inscribed in two registers on the upper mouldings. H. 89, w. 85 (doors 54), th. 32, lett 0.8-2.1

Pl. 4 .

[ΤΩ ΣΕΙΝΙ ΤΟΥ ΣΕΙΝΟΣ ἡ ΣΕΙΝΔ]

[---]α ἡ γ[υ]νη αὐτοῦ καὶ Οὐαλεριος Ρουφος δ υἱος

[αγο]ρὰ νομῆσαντι καὶ στρατηγῆσαντι καὶ εἰρηναρχῆσαντι
καὶ δεκάπρωτευσαντι

ντ [i vac? μνει]ας Χάριν ἵσταντι ἐτη λχ'

1.3 These offices were presumably performed at Sebaste, if the location of Dioskome in this area can be trusted (p. 15).

20. DEDEBALLAR, in the wall of the school; previously, it is said, in the cemetery. White marble doorstone with arched pediment, broken below and right. H. 45 plus, w. 57 plus, th. 15,

plus, lett. 1.3-1.5. In the pediment, mirror and comb. Pl. 5 .

[Γ]δὸς καὶ Εὐμενὴς Ἐπὶ δ' αὖθις τῷ πατρὶ [Ι]
 μνηστῆρος χάριν.

21. SELCIKLER, in the cemetery. Fragment of white marble doorstone, broken above and left, buried below. H. 105 plus, w. 32 plus, th. 27, lett. 1.5-1.7. The entablature below the gabled pediment is supported on fluted pilasters. Pl. 3 .

---] is } ωντες leaf.

22. SELCIKLER, in a wall near the mosque. White marble doorstone, broken below. H. 29 plus, w. 61, th. -, lett. 1.2 - 1.5. Gabled pediment with mirror in relief and acroteria above. Pl. 3 .

---]ιος καὶ Ζηνοδοτος Ἀμφὶ τῇ μητρὶ μνηστῆρος χάριν]
 The fifth preserved letter is ζ on the stone.

23. AKARCA, in a fountain 100 m. W of the mosque. Fragment of white marble doorstone, with arched pediment, complete above. H. 47 plus, w. 57 plus, th. -, lett. 1.4 - 1.8. Pl. 4 .

Χαίρετε πα-
 ροδῖται. ταῦτα λέ-
 γει Τροφίμος κατὰ κ-
 εῖμενος [Ω] ἐνὶ τυμβῷ

5. [.]

24. KIRKA, in a fountain c. 1 km. from the village, on the way to Kapaklar. Marble doorstone, broken below. H. 66 plus, w. 88, th. 15 plus, lett. 2-3.5. In the arched pediment, a wreath in

relief. Pl. 5 .

Γάιος Τάτιος γυναικὶ φρονίμῳ καὶ φιλόδοξῳ
καὶ ἐλευ[τ]ῶ ἡμῶν μνη[μης χά]ριν.

Published CB ii, no. 507.

25. KIRKA, in a fountain. Marble doorstone. H. 85, w. 54, th. -, lett. 1.0 - 1.9. In the gabled pediment, patera or circular boss; in the door-panels 1) lyre and plectrum ?, 2) keyplate, 3) stilus-case, 4) spindle and distaff. Pl. 4 .

ἔτε

τρεῖς κοσμοστω δ' μ(ηρος) δ'

Αὐρ. Γλυκίων

11. ὅς δ' ἐν

Παρθένου

σε ἔτε-

5. ἐλευτῶ

πον θη-

καὶ Ἀριμίδ συνβίω

σεῖ ἀποδω

ἡ-

15. σεῖ ἰς το τδ-

625

μειον * φ'

ἔτη

10.05

1.4 For Paithos cf. no. 31.

Date probably A.D. 215.

26. KIRKA, by the mosque. Marble bomos. H. 77, w. 48, 35 - 39, 43, th. 41, 34, -, lett. 3.3. Pl. 4 .

[ε]τους τμ'

Αὐρ. Τειμοκρ-

ατης Ἀρτῶ τῶ ι-

σίω ἀλελφῶ κ

(sic)

5 Ἀρτὰ Β' <ς> καὶ τῇ γυ-
ναικὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀ-
[μ]ιδ καὶ τοῖς τεκνύ-
οις αὐτοῦ Τειμο[κ]
πατρὸς καὶ Κουαρτί-

10. ἀλὴ μνήμης χάριν

Date A.D. 255/6.

27. ERICE, in the porch of the mosque. Coarse marble bomos, broken below, upper mouldings cut off. H. 81 plus, w. -, 44, -, th. -, 38, -, lett. 2.5 - 2.8. Below the inscription, male and female busts; on left side, tablets and stilus-case. Pl. 5 .

[. ME]-
νδρσπον τῇ καὶ κλε-
οπάτρῃ συνβίῳ γλυ-
κυτότῃ τελευτοῖω

5. το μνημεῖον κ[α]

[τ]εσκενδοσε[ν]

[κ]αὶ ἔ-

[αὐτῷ μνήμης χάριν]

The inscription, if ever completed, must have been continued below the busts.

28. YAYALAR, by the mosque. Marble stele with pediment and lateral pilasters, originally with tenon below; broken above and below. H. 155 plus, w. 47, 44, 50, th. 17, lett. 1.4 - 2.2. In the pediment, eagle with wings extended; on the shaft, wreath with fillets. Pl. 5 .

Ἀριστιῶν
καὶ Θεογενῆς
καὶ Μητρ[ο]δ[ω]ρος
καὶ Εὐαγορ[α]ς

5. Ἀτταλ[ω] τῷ πα-

τρι φιλο<τι>-

τεκνῶ

μνή-

μης χά-

10. ριν

11.6-7 The alternative φιλοτιμῶ καὶ φιλοτεκνῶ is ruled out by lack of space.

A

29. SIVASLI, in a street. Marble doorstone with gabled pediment, broken above. H. 90 plus, w. 79, th. 18, lett. 1.5 - 2. In the pediment, comb, mirror and bottle; in the panels 1) plant ?, 2) key-plate, 3) boss, 4) ring. Pl. 6 .

Published CB ii, no. 490.

Ἀσκλης β' τῇ μητρὶ μνήμης χάριν

30. KIRKA, in a fountain by the mosque. Doorstone with gabled pediment, broken below. H. 46 plus, w. 54, th. -, lett. 2.3-3.0. In the pediment, circular boss. Pl. 6 .

[Α]ρτεμις [ωρ]ο[ς] Ἡλιδῆ Χριστιανῶ

Montanist (see, p.^{75, n.2}).

31. Ancient site between PIYANLI and Balli Kaya, among rubble from the destruction of a Byzantine church (p. 8). Marble

bomos, broken above, mouldings defaced. H. 74 plus, w. -, 27-28, -, th. -, 26-28, -, lett. 1.6 - 2.0. On the left side, in relief, hammer and bill-hook; on the right side, spindle, distaff and comb. Pl. 5 .

Μηνοφιλος καὶ
ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ
Αμμιὰ Παιθῶ ἀ-
δελφῶ Χρυσιστι-
5. ανῶ καὶ Ἀλεξαν-
δρι καὶ τῶ Παιθῶ ἀν-
δρὶ καὶ τῶ Παιθῶ
αὐτῶν μνηστῆρας
χάριν ἐπυῆσαν

1.6 Paithos, probably a variant of the Latin Paetus, occurs also in no. 25. Confusion between theta and tau is not uncommon in Phrygia. This Paithos was a Montanist

32. SELCIKLER, in the old cemetery. Marble block, broken left, chipped right. H. 76, w. 54 plus, th. 26, lett. 2.0 - 2.2. The right and bottom edges of the stone have a Byzantine cavetto moulding, common in the sixth century, suggesting that it was recut at that time. Pls. 6, P1.

[...c.8...] Fl. Buraid [o]
[...c.5...] CTORESCOIE [---]
[---] nova posuit [iu]st-
am coniucem su[a]m [f]i[li]-
5. [i]am Ursiniani ex(ceptoris) trib(uni)
qua(e) convixit cum eo [d]

- em annis xviii vixit [e]t[i] [a-]
 m in tota vita sua anni[s]
 xxvii si quis etiam vo! [u-]
 10. erit preter Oeno[- - - - - s-]
 epelipe corpus in han[c me-]
 moriam det fisci virib[us]
 auri p(ondo) v. scripto et
 [p]osito titulo cons(ulatu) d. [n]
 15. Valentinian(i) Au[g] i[iii]
 et Neoteri v.c. leaf.

O is used for Q throughout. The lapicide also had difficulty with F, L & R.

1.1 A Buraido (Christian) at Hippo Regius, CIL viii, no. 5229, ILS i, no. 2811.

1.3 Perhaps arca nova (ablative).

1.5 Ursinianus, an eques stablesianus, is known from the Greek epitaph of his daughter Hel(i)opolis, also at Selcikler; JRS xvi, 1926, pp. 92 f., no. 225; SEG vi, no. 187. As his rank is there not mentioned, the restoration given above is probably to be preferred to the alternative ex tribuni. Date A.D. 390.

1.10 Perhaps Oenopionem. The family had a taste for unusual names.

33. SELCIKLER, near the mosque. Architrave in coarse greyish-white marble, with one end broken, the other recut as a phallus. H. 45, w. 104 plus, th. 36, uninscribed. The drawing shows the under surface of the architrave. Pl. 6.

34. KIRKA, in a house. Head and elongated neck of a leopard in fine white marble, probably from a table-leg, A flat fillet (6 cm. wide) runs down the back and continued above to support the table-top. Broken above and below. H. 27 plus, w. 11.5, th. 24. Uninscribed. Pl. P₁ .

For the type of table, cf. G.M.A. Richter, Ancient Furniture, Oxford 1926, pp. 87 f., 139 f., fig. 328, showing a complete example. A closer parallel for this type of leg is BMC Greek Sculpture iii (1904), no. 2526.

PHRYGIA PACATIANA

Akmonia and the Northern Banaz Ova

Akmonia. This is the one really certain point in an area whose topography is far less certain than one could wish, in spite of the very large amount of epigraphic material collected in the past eighty years.

The ancient site lies just S of the modern village of Ahat, on a steep-sided triangular spur protected on two sides by the Banaz Cay and one of its tributaries. The walls, now completely destroyed, probably enclosed an area about 400 x 150 m. On the SE, the only side that is not extremely steep, a broad flat saddle connects the spur to the foothills of Çatmalı Dağ.

Water was supplied under pressure by an underground aqueduct of stout marble pipes, and the section that crossed the saddle from the foothills into the city has recently been robbed out. Some of the pipes were cut from statue-bases and architectural blocks (e.g. nos. 38, 42-44) which suggests a late date.

Within the city, remains of at least three buildings, one probably a temple, are still distinguishable. One of the other two was partially excavated in 1954-5 by Bay Süleyman Gönçer, Director of the Afyon Museum. It consisted of a rectangular room terminating in an apse. The floor was of geometric mosaic except in the apse, where there was a rectangular panel depicting three pairs of wrestlers, with inscriptions giving their names and places of origin. Above this panel was another representing

a table, apparently for the prizes, and on either side of the main panel smaller ones containing female figures, inscribed Ἀγυρκοθεοῖς and Γυμνασίου respectively. On the floor lay two life-sized marble statues, probably representing an Emperor and Empress, which had fallen from niches in the wall of the apse. The building, presumably some part of a gymnasium, appeared to have been destroyed by an earthquake; other rooms of it were not excavated.

The above description was kindly given me by the excavator. Nothing was visible above ground except part of the wall of the apse. The text of the inscriptions is given below (no. 47).

The other buildings described by Hamilton (Researches i, pp. 116 ff.) appear to have been entirely destroyed. They included a theatre, an odeion or smaller theatre, a possible church, a considerable stretches of the city wall and a paved road leading in from the SE.

Traianopolis and Grimenothyrai. The site ^{of Traianopolis} is roughly fixed by three inscriptions (no. 36; IGR iv, nos. 623, 627) in the area of Gâvur Üren, Ortaköy and Çarık Köyü. Gâvur Üren, near the village of Mesudiye, was certainly a settlement of some size in the Roman period, though there is nothing about it at present to suggest that it was a city. The only new inscription found was no. 70, a very poor object. At İyileşler Kayası, a cliff 3 km. to the north, there are a large number of rock-cut chambers, some virtually inaccessible, that seem to have been hermits' cells rather than tombs*. Many of them have rock-cut chutes in the cliff face that might have been used for hauling up supplies or for sanitary purposes. Beyond the cliff is an extensive

* Pl. P1, A.

ancient quarry. The stone is a greyish-brown volcanic tufa, remarkably like the Gabine tufa used in Rome. If this was the principal material used at the Gâvur Ören site it may well explain the lack of ancient building blocks at Mesudiye.

Çarlık Köyü contains a large number of ancient stones, but the surface remains of ancient settlement are less obvious than those at Gâvur Ören, perhaps only because Çarlık Köyü is older and more prosperous than Mesudiye. Buresch (Aus Lydien, pp. 168 f.) was under the impression that both Ortaköy and Çarlık lay on parts of the same large ancient site, and if this is correct it seems highly probable that Traianopolis was situated there. Some of the stones there (e.g. nos. 37, 69, 71) are very large and are hardly likely to have been carried far.

According to Ptolemy (V, 2, 13) Traianopolis belonged to the Grimenothyritai, who, as appears from coins, had a centre called Grimenothyrai, which struck coins both before and after the foundation of Traianopolis. It is generally agreed that this Grimenothyrai was a separate city (HN (2), p. 674, RE s.vv. Grimenothyrai, Traianopolis) but we have no indication of its position, except that it cannot have been further south than Çarlık, so long as the location of Dioskome at Kapaklar or Kırka (p. 15) is accepted. There is plenty of room for it further to the north, where the tribe no doubt owned much of the southern foothills of Murat Dağı.

Temenothyrai-Flaviopolis. The approximate position is fixed by no less than eight inscriptions recorded at Uşak (Keil-v. Premerstein, II, p. 133, RE s.v. Temenothyrai). Any inscription found at Uşak is automatically a little suspect, as the town was

for many years a collecting-centre for the antiquities trade, so that this evidence cannot be entirely relied on. A suitable site near Uşak has yet to be found. In 1956, after a powerful spring had broken out under the new post office, the deep trench that was cut right through the town to carry off the water produced negligible archaeological results.

Alia, placed by Radet and Ramsay at Islam Köyü (^{En}Phrygie p. ? , CB ii, p. 593), depends for its position entirely on Hierocles (668), who puts it between Akmonia and Siokharax.

Keramon Agora, mentioned only by Xenophon, is probably somewhere in this area, as Hamilton calculated from Xenophon's distances (Researches ii, p. 203), but greater accuracy is impossible (RE s.v. *Κερμων Ἀγορά*).

Other ancient sites in the northern Banaz Ova. At Banaz Köyü there are signs of ancient settlement a little NW of the village. At Karlık a Roman cemetery at the E end of the village was being destroyed by gravel workings in 1956 (cf. no. 67), but there was no positive indication of an inhabited site to which it could have belonged. At Kızılcı Söğüt, the large number of inscriptions (nos. 66, 72 and a number of quite illegible doorstones) suggests the presence of an ancient site in the vicinity.

Akmonia and the Northern Banaz Ova

Inscriptions

35. ISLAM KÖYÜ (Banaz Kazası), in a yard near the railway station. Bluish-white marble block, later re-cut as the winch-bed of a wine-press, and said to have been brought from Hatıplar. Broken above, at front only. H. 95, w. 54.5, th. 54.5, lett. 2.5 - 3.5. Pl. 7 .

[-----]
[-----]
[-----]
[-----]

5. [-----] σαμένων ἐκ [πε-]
 ρισσευσάντων στεφ-
 νικῶν κατὰ συνχωρεῖ[ν?]
 Μαρίου(ν) Μαξιμου ἀνθυπ-
 [α]του ἐπιμεληθέντων
 10. τῆς κατασκευῆς καὶ
 ἀναστάσεως τῶν περὶ Γ.
 Παύ. Πεισωνεῖνον πρω-
 τον ἀρχόντα ἀρ[χ]όντων
 καὶ Α.Τ[-----]
 15. νιδνον.

11. 1-4 There is room on the stone for a maximum of four lines most of which was probably taken up by a dedication to Caracalla, as it seems unlikely that money collected to pay for aurum coronarium would have been applied to other purposes.

11. 6-7 On Caracalla's exactions of aurum coronarium cf.
Dio Cassius, lxxviii, 9, 2.

1. 8 Marius Maximus was proconsul of Asia in 214/5; Roman
Rule ii, p. 1585.

11. 13 ff. The original text probably ended at ἀρχόντα ;
cf. no. 97 .

36. ORTAKÖY, in a fountain on the main street. Grey marble block,
part of a base. H. 109, w. 56, th. 52, lett. 2.6 - 3.4. Pl. 7 .

- ἀγαθὴ τύχη
 [β] [βουλ[η]] καὶ ὁ δῆμος [δ?]
 [Γ] [κ]αινοπολείτων [vac?]
 [Α] [υ]τ[οκρ]ά[τορ] καὶ
 5. [σ]αρὰ Λ. Σεπτίμιον Σε
 [ου]ρη[ρ]ον γῆς καὶ θαλά[σ]-
 [σ]ης [δ]εσποτῆν.
 [τ]ῆς ἀνδοτσέως
 [ε]π[ι] [μ]εληθέντων
 10. [Μ]ε[ν] [α]νδρου Κελερος ← [κ]αὶ Φ[ι]λ[ι]ππου Εὐοδου
 [καὶ] Αἰλ[ι]ανου Οὐαλερίου
 [ἀρ]χ[όν]των καὶ τοῦ γραμ-
 [μ]α[τε]ρ[ω]ς Γαίου Οὐνησιμου
 15. [λ]ογιστευοντος Φλ. vac.
 [Π]ρ[ο]εισ[κ]ου ἔτους σπβ'.

Modern attempts to decorate the face of the stone have
resulted in the destruction of many letters seen by Buresch.
These are underlined in the text given here.

11. 4-6 In Inscr. Bur. and IGR the titles of Trebonianus Gallus are restored at this point, though this involves the assumption that Traianopolis, which in earlier inscriptions used the Sullan Era, later switched to the Actian Era. No certain traces of letters are visible in the erasure, which was very thoroughly carried out. On the improbability of a change of era, see RE s.v. Traianopolis 2.

Date. A.D. 197/8 or 251/2.

Published, Inscr. Bur., p. 33, no. 60; thence IGR iv, no. 626.

37. ÇARIK KÜYÜ, in the kibleh wall of the mosque. Block of blue-veined white marble, chipped right. H. 166, w. 82 plus, th. -, lett. (1.1) 5, (remainder) 3.5 - 4.0. Pl. 7 .

ἀγαθὴ Τύχη

Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα vac.

Μ. Αὐρηλίον Ἀντωνίνο[ν]

Σεβαστον Ἀρμενικόν

5. Παρθικόν καὶ Αὐτοκράτορα

Καίσαρα Λουκίον Αὐρηλίον[ν]

Οὐγγρον Σεβαστον Ἀρμε-

νικόν καὶ Μηδικόν leaf

leaf. ἡ πόλις leaf.

10. ἐπὶ Ἱεροκλεοῦς Ἀρχετεί-

μου ἀρχόντος το β' καὶ Ἀρτ[ε-]

μῶνος Ἑρμογενοῦ καὶ Φιλάνθου Τρ[υ]-

φῶνος καὶ γράμματεο[ς]

Διονυσίου Πυθωδωρο[ν]

15. ἐπιμεληθέντος Νεικ[ο-]

μα[χ]ου β' ἔτους σ[υ]ν'

μήνος ιβ' γά

added much later, below the main inscription, in letters 2.5 -4.5.

Ἐπὶ (γλῶσς?) defaced Maltese cross.

1.8 The κ of Μηδικόν has been altered from χ .

1.12 Possibly Ἑρμοῦτιμον , not Ἑρμογενους.

1.16 σνδ confirmed by further removal of plaster after the impression, on which the drawing was based, had been made.

1.17 The final letters are certainly γα' , perhaps, as suggested by Ramsay, an error for ιδ' , being the day of the month.

1.18 The γ stands quite alone and has never been satisfactorily explained.

Date; A.D. 167, August-September.

Published CIG iii, no. 3865 c; CB ii, no. 516; Inscr. Bur. no.62.

38. AHAT, in the wall of the school garden, by the main gate. Whitish marble block reused as a water-pipe. Dowel-hole in top; bored through from right to left, broken below, sunk in concrete right, chipped above. H.53 plus, w. 40, th. 39, lett. 1.7 - 2.2. Pl. 6 .

ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ
 ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ [δῆμος]
 ἐτείμησαν Κν[ιντον?]
 Κλαυδίου Πωλιων[α]
 5. Τιβερίου Κλα[ύδ]ιου Εὐ-
 ξένου υἱὸν [τῶν ἀνδρῶν]
 ἀντὶ στήσαντ[ων] ἐκ τῶ[ν]

ἰδίῳ Ζηνοδοτ[ο]ῦ καὶ [ο]
 ρεστού τῶν ὀρεσ[του]

10. [---c.8---] αὐτὸν ἦ

The underlined parts of the text are not guaranteed by any facsimile.

1.10 perhaps διὰ τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν εὐνοίαν.

39. AHAT, in the wall of a house near the school. Off-white marble base, with slight mouldings above and below. Upper moulding broken. H. 104, w. 49 plus, 44-47, 56, th. 45 plus, 43-46, 51, lett. 2.7 - 4.5. Pls. 8, P₂.

ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆ-
 [μος] ἐτείμησεν
 [-] Γάδιον Κλυδιδιον
 [Ε]γνατιον Βιγελλιον

5. Οὐδ' αὖτε Οὐλπίον
 Ἀντωνιον Πωλιων[α]
 Τερεντυλλιδιον
 ἀρχιερεων Ἀσίδας
 ἐκγονον ἱερεα

10. διὰ βίου τοῦ ἐπιφά-
 νεστατοῦ Θεοῦ
 Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ ἀγω-
 νοθετην των μεγά-
 λων Ἀσκληπιειων

15. ἀρετῆς καὶ παιδείας
 leaf. ἐνεκεν leaf.

1.6 For the spelling of Πωλιων, cf. BMC Phrygia, p. lxx.

1.12 Asklepios often appears on coins of Akmonia, BMC Phrygia, pp. 4 ff.

40. ISLAM KÖYÜ, in a fountain. White Dokimian marble stele with pilasters at sides and tenon below. Broken above and at sides of base. H. 212 plus, w. -, 66, -, th. -, 19-21, 28, lett. 1.8 - 2.5. Pl. 8 .

[----- γυ]-

νδικες Ἑλληνι-
δες τε καὶ Ῥωμαί-
δι ἐτείμησαν τὰ-

5. τὴν Μηνόκριτου
τὴν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν
γυνδικὰ δὲ Μηνό-
σοτου Μενελάου
τοῦ καὶ Σιλλωνος

10. τὴν ἀρχιεργάν εὐ-
εργετὶν ἐμ πάν-
τι καὶ ῥω γενηθεῖ
σαν αὐτῶν πόσ-
ης ἀρετῆς ἐνε-

15. κεν ναε.

τὴν ἐπιμελήσαν
ποιήσαντον Κρά-
τητος Μηνόκριτου
τοῦ καὶ Μενελάου καὶ

20. Ποπλίου Πετρω-
νίου Ἐπιγενοῦς

καὶ Μηνόκριτου
Ἀγλαοκλέως
ἔτους αῑ'

11. 7 ff. Menodotos Sillon is known from early coins of Akmonia; BMC Phrygia, p. 6.

11. 17 ff. Krates son of Menokritos occurs on coins of Akmonia under Augustus; BMC Phrygia, p.9.

Date A.D. 6/7.

41. AHAT, in the wall of a house. Marble base with traces of upper mouldings, broken below. H. 54 plus, w. -, 58, -, th. -, 58, -, lett. 1.2 - 3.1. The two exposed faces, front and left, have sunk panels. Pl. 41 .

βυρα λοχου σευ-
τερου τριβουνου
πλατ[υς]ημον

11. 1-2 The reading is certain and there is no sign of erasure above. The text presumably began on one of the two sides now hidden, and contained other elements of a senatorial cursus honorum. Possibly ταμιων ἐπαρχείας Ἀσίδας ἐν Κιβύρα , though I can find no parallel for such an expression or for the use of λοχος in the sense of legio.

42. AHAT, outside a house. Marble base, moulded above and below, later bored vertically for use as a water-pipe. Broken behind. H. 36, w. 70, 63, -, th. 63 plus, 60 plus, -, lett. 2.5 - 3.5,

diameter of hole 22. Pl. 8 .

ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ
ἡ Βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος
ἐτείμησαν Αἰλίδν
Πωλλὰν ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν.

43-44. AHAT, in a lane below the ancient site. Whitish marble base, later cut in two and bored vertically to make pipes for the aqueduct. H. (43) 60 plus, (44) 60 plus, w. 59, 53-55, 62, th. 58, 55-58, 63, lett. 2.9 - 3.5 with some exceptions. Pl. 9 .

④ 3 ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ
Τ. Φλ. Μοντάνον
Μαξιμίανον τὸν
κράτιστον κυδιστορά
5. τὰμιν Ἀφρικῆς
ἀγοράνομον κεράλιον
στρατηγὸν δῆμου
Ῥωμαίων ἐπιμελετήν

10. [-----]
[-----]
[-----]
[-----]

④ 4 ἡγεμόνα Ἡράκλῆς
ὑπάτον ἡ πατρίς
15. τὸν κτιστὴν καὶ εὐ-
εργετὴν ~~leat~~ ἐπιμελησά-
μενου Τ. Φλ. Λεντούλου
vac. ἀρχιερέως vac.
τοῦ συγγενοῦς αὐτοῦ.

11. 2 ff. The name supplies the restoration of an honorific inscription at Ephesos (see PIR (2) iii, p. 160, no. 323); T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus was perhaps a relative of the T. Flavius Montanus honoured as Asiarch at Akmonia and Ephesos; PIR loc. cit., Social Basis, pp. 33 ff., 161 f.

11.8 ff. At least four lines have been lost in the recutting of the stone.

45. AHAT, in a house. Upper part of a marble base with decorated upper mouldings. The lower part was made from a separate block. Broken right, behind and at top of left side. H. 36, w. 49 plus, 34 plus, -, th. 43 plus, -, -, lett. 4.5. Pl. 9 .

ἀγαθῇ [τύχῃ]

Published CIG iii, no. 3858 g.?

46. SUSUZ, in a fountain (Kavacık Çeşmesi). White marble architrave-block, probably unbroken. H. 35.5, w. 135, th. -, lett. (1.1) 5.7, (1.2) 4.9. Pl. 8 .

-- Θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς καὶ ἱερῷ Συγκλήτῳ --
-- τὰ στήναι καὶ τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῶν κοσμήσιν --

1.1 For the gender cf. IGR iv, no. 522, Θεῶι Ῥωμῆι καὶ Θεῶι Συγκλήτῳ.

47. AHAT, mosaic pavement of a building on the site of Akmonia (see pp. 31 f.) No measurements. Pl. 9 ., from sketch by Süleyman Bey only.

On the main panel, letters 6-7 cm.

Διονυ- Βανθλὰς Ῥουφὸς Φίλο[^{37.5m}] ΕΡΑΦΑΜ. Δει-
σι(ο)ς δαξ (sic)
Μαγνης Ἀλεξαν- Ἐφεσι(ο)ς Ἐφε[σι(ο)ς] [-----] Ἀλεξαν-
δρεὺς δρεὺς

On the lateral panels.

1) Ἀγωνοθεσία

2) Γυμνασίδριον

48. AHAT, in the stairs of a house near the river. Architrave, broken above and below. H. 24 plus, w. 102, th. 44 plus, lett. (1.1) 6, (1.2) 4.2. Not illustrated.

vac redemptis a sed [---

vac. Εὐν τοῖς ἡροσκε[ιμένοις ----

Probably part of the same inscription as MAMA vi, no. 333 and CB ii, no. 541 (CIL iii, no. 7049). The parts confirmed by an impression are underlined. The remainder of the text was quite certain.

Published CIG iii, no. 3860 k 2, thence CB ii, no. 542.

49. AHAT, in a lane. Architrave and frieze block. The architrave has a soffit-panel with two tritons, a fish-tailed bull and a fish-tailed wolf or lion. The frieze is decorated with an acanthus scroll, with a lion among the foliage. Broken both sides. H. 54, w. 146 plus, th. (above) 50, (below) 33, lett. 7.3 - 7.8. Pl. P2 .

---] τῇ γλυκύτῃ πατρὶδι τ[---

50. ŞABAN, in a house; said to have been recently excavated nearby. White marble bomos, broken below, upper mouldings damaged. H. 50 plus, w. 31 plus, 28, -, th. 32 plus, 28, -, lett. 2 - 3. Below the inscription, fish and trident; on the back, dolphin or shark ?; on the left and right sides, wreaths with fillets. Pl. 9 .

M. Αδρκιος
Λεντουλος
ἀνεθηκε

51. GEDIKLER, in a wall; said to have come from an ancient site between Gedikler and Üksüz in 1952. White marble (of a type said to have been quarried at Sazlı Kuyu on Burgaz Dağı) post, probably from the banister of an ambo-stair. In the bottom, a dowel-hole; chipped above. H. 74, w. 13, th. 11.5, lett. 2 - 2.5. Pl. 9 .

ἡ(ν)δ(ικτιωνος) ἡ(του)

σφραγίς

Θ(εο)υ κε-

λενο-

5. ι ἐγε-

νετο

ὁ ἀνβ-

ων ἐπ-

ι Μεν-

10. ἀ πρω-

τοπρε-

σβυτε

πον cross.

Date; according to the Creation date in 1.2, A.D. 1089/90; but this should be the 13th of the indiction, not the 7th as stated in 1.1. For a similar lack of correspondence, cf. no. 112.

52. BANAZ KÖYÜ, in a house. Squat base of white Dokimian marble,

moulded above and below. H. 19, w. 44, 40, 44, th. 28, 26, 28, lett. 1.5 - 2.0. Pl. 9 .

Γ. Οὐειβιος Λογγος νεωτερ(ος)
 κ' Ὑμεναιος Ἑρμῆ Κουρητε
 το ἱερον παρ' αὐτῶν ἀνεθ[ε]-
 σαν ναε ἔτει σ[-]

1.2 Priests of the Kouretes, who themselves bore the name Kouretes, are found at Ephesos; RE s.v. Kureten, col. 2205 f.; The divine Kouretes appear on coins of Akmonia; HN (2) p. 663. Date A.D. 115-216.

53. KAYLI, in a lane. Bomos, broken below, left and behind. H. 46 plus, w. -, 54 plus, -, th. 38 plus, -, -, lett. 2.0 - 2.5. Pl. 10 .

ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ
 [ῆ] συνβιωσις
 [Α]λσηνω εἰλεως τῇ
 [κ]ατοικιδ. ἔτους τ'.
 5. [Α]λσηνω πατριω μεγάλῳ Διὶ βω-
 μον ἔθηκεν||
 [ε]νεα καὶ δεκα φῶτες λαμπροί
 [κ]αὶ σεμνοὶ Ἀχαιοὶ||
 [----ε.ιι----]ϕ[-]ΛΥΚΕΙΟΤ[?]

1.2 cf. CB ii, no. 309 and note.

11. 3,5 Zeus Alsenos is known from several dedications at Appola, near Polybotos; MAMA i, no. 435 and note.

1.8 Possibly the members of the symbiosis were Eumeneians, who, as their coinage shows, claimed Achaean descent. BMC Phrygia,

p. lxi; CERP, p. 54.

Date A.D. 215/6.

54. SUSUZ, in the yard of a house by the river. White marble base or bomos, cut off below, left side recut as a basin or stoup, with drain behind; top rough as if cut off. H. 106 plus, w. -, 46 plus, -, th. -, 52, -, lett. 3 - 3.6. Pl. 10 .

I. On the front, in a moulded panel.

[A]λεξανδρος ὁ κ[ι']

[A]χολις ἡσας ἐτη ὁ

βουλευτης

ἀγορανομῆσας

5. σειτωνησας

πανηγυριάρχης

μετρήσας πάλιν

τῇ ἀγορᾷ κυ(αθους) 55'

στρατηγῆσας

II. On the right side, in a moulded panel.

πολλων κληρονομ[ων]

ἐπιγινωσκων ἀμελιδ[ων] //

Εὐτυχιστης ῥαψω-

δος Ἀλεξανδρος

5. τοδε σημεῖον ἑαυτῷ

ἡων ἀνεθῆκα

καὶ τῇ φίλῃ συν-

ομευνῶ // Ἀντω-

νιδ ἡωση μνημα

10. μακρου βιοτου //

εἰ δε τις ᾗ τυμβον

πρίδτε ἡ γράμμα
 . [ἐπιγράφει//? (probably continued on the back)

I, 1.2 On the name, see CB loc. cit. infra, and cf. IGR iv, no. 1510. In spite of it Alexandros can hardly have been a Christian.

II, 1.2 ῥαψωδός also suggests that Alexandros was a pagan, unless it means merely that he composed his own epitaph.

Published (I only), CB ii, no. 462.

55. EMIRAZ, in a lane. Marble bomos with omphaloid top, moulded panels on all four sides. On left side, patera (?) in relief, on right side tablets and stilus-case. Broken above and below.
 H. 80 plus, w. 47 plus, 41, -, th. 42, 36, -, lett. 1.3 - 2.2
 Pl. 10 .

[.ε.ε.-] M[.ε.ε.-] P[.ε.ε.-]

[.] [Ἀ]λέξανδρος Εὐμένεως Βου[λευ]-

της Φυλής Ἀρτεμεισίδου[ς]

το θεμέτιον καὶ τὸν ἐφ' [αὐτῷ]

5. τοῦ βωμοῦ Ἰων[ος] [αὐτῷ]-

τῷ καὶ τῇ γλυκύτ[ατῃ]

τεκνοῦσιν Ἀντηλίδ[ος]

[αὐτῷ] [αὐτῷ] καὶ τῇ γυν[αίκε]

μεν Ἀντ. Ἀντισιδ[ος] [τῇ καὶ]?

10. Ἀντωνίδ[ος] καὶ τοῖς

<καὶ τοῖς> ἐκ γονοῖς

μου κατεσκεύασα

- το ἥρωον οὐδενί
 ἑτέρω ἔξον ἔσται [κη]
 15. δειθηναι ἐν αὐτῷ
 [ὅς] δ' ἐν ἐπιτηδεύ-
 [ση] θήσει ἐ[ῖς] τὸ ἴσο[ν]
 [τὰ] μέγιστον ✕ φ'

The surface of the stone is very worn, especially on the left where some lines ^{may} begin on the border of the panel.

1.3 The tribe Artemisias is known at Akmonia (CB ii, no. 532), but not at Eumeneia (JRS xvi, 1926, p.71, no. 196).

56. USAK, in a street; said to have been brought from Hamitli Köy, White marble stele with pediment above and tenon below; complete but cracked across the middle. H. 205, w. 67, 56-58, 75, th. 18, lett. 1.6 - 2.3. In the field 1) lion, 2) ox-head, 3) lion, 4-5) wreaths, 6) comb, 7) mirror, 8) tablets, 9) stilus-case, 10) spindle, 11) distaff, 12) tear-bottle, 13) crescent(?). Pl. II, based on sketch and impression only.

- ἔτους σβ'
 [Κ]ουρίδ Κυδωνεὶδ συν τῷ ἀνδρὶ
 Ἀπελλᾶ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἴδουσι
 καὶ Ἀπελλᾶ τοῖς γλυκνύταις γο-
 5. νεύει κοῖντῳ καὶ κορυντή μνεί-
 ας χάρι

1.2 Κουρίδ on the copy; [Φ]ουρίδ is also possible.

Date A.D. 117/8.

57. SUSUZ, in a fountain (Kırkpınarlar Çesmesi) outside the village. White marble block with tabula ansata, probably complete. H.65, w. 73, th. -, lett. 2.2 - 2.8 Pl. 10 .

leaf. V(otum) leaf.

L. Aelius . L. f. Fab(ia) Ve-
nustus Tyrrani-
ae Veneriae uxo-

5. ri suae et sibi [vi?]
[vus?] et M. Iuni-
us M. f. Sab(atina) Lupus
Aeliae L. f. Mar-
cellae uxori leaf.

10. suae et sibi [- -]
[- - - - c. 12 - - - -]

The missing letters in ll. 5-6 and 10-11 were erased in antiquity.

58. SUSUZ, in the wall of a house. Bomos, buried below. H. 60 plus, w. 46, 39, -, th. 41, 38, -, lett. 2.4 - 2.8. On the front, below the inscription, a wreath. Pl. Pz .

[Αῦρ] Ῥουφος ἐαυτῷ leaf

[κδ]τ τη γυναικι μο[v]

Τεπειδ Ἰῶν κδε-
σκευδσεν το μνη-

5. μειον. εἰ δε τις ἀν-

[v]ξει μετὰ τὸ τεθην[di]

τοὺς δυο ἀνωρ τε[κvd]

προθοιτ[ο]

11. 7-8 cf. CB ii, no. 620 (= IGR iv, no. 665) and below, no. 61.

59. HASAN KÜYÜ, in a lane. Marble architrave, moulded on front, back and left, broken right. H. 29, w. 50 plus, th. (above) 37, (below) 17, lett. 4.9 - 5.2 Pl. 10, from sketch only.

Τοις ὑπὸ τοῖς - - -

60. Between ŞABAN and ERCİŞ, in a fountain (Deydivan Çeşmesi). White marble doorstone with arched pediment. H. 80, w. 51, th. -, lett. 1.3 - 2.6. In the pediment, spindle, distaff, mirror and comb; panels of door blank; lateral pilasters have scale or leaf pattern. Pl. 10.

Ἐρμῶνς τῇ γυναικὶ Πριμὰ μν(ή)μης Χάριν

61. AHAT, in the wall of a house at the north end of the village, by the track to Banaz; plain limestone block, apparently complete. H. 82, w. 57, th. 27, lett. 2 - 3. Pl. 11.

Ἀδρκίος Διονυσίος Κλ-
τδοσκευδοὺς τὸ μνημ-
ὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ γυναικί
ζωτικῇ ἐπεθεσμένην ἄρην

5. μετὰ τὸ ἀποθεωθῆναι
τοὺς δύο ὅς ἐν ἀνυξί το
μνημίων ἀπὸ τεκνῶ
προβοίτο εἶς.



62. AHAT, in a lane. Doorstone without pediment. H. 65, w. 58, th. 23, lett. 1.4 - 1.7. In the panels 1) blank, 2) key-plate, 3) blank, 4) object resembling the handle of a bucket. Pl. II .

Σωσθενης Σωσθενου τοῦ Γλυκωνος
Σωσθενη πατρι καὶ Διονυσια μητρὶ μνήμης
χάριν.

63. AHAT, in a lane beyond the bridge, at the foot of the acropolis. Marble doorstone with rounded pediment and ivy-scroll pilasters. H. 85, w. 73, th. 25, lett. 1.2 - 2.5. In the pediment, cobbler's last(?), leather-kife, awl. In the panels; 1) blank, 2) key-plate, 3) blank, 4) ring. Pl. 11 .

Πεδιος Τερκονδτος ζωτῶνι ἀδελφῶ μνήμης
χάριν
εἰ τις αὐτὸ ἀρῇ πενθήσεται τοὺς ἰδίους.

The leather-knife (cf. no. 65) is of a type still in use locally.

64. AHAT, in the wall of the school garden. Marble architrave reused as a water-pipe. Broken or cut away above, below, left and right. H. 39 plus, w. 67 plus, th. 48, lett. 6.5 - 7.0 Pl. 11 .

---?Κλα]υδιος Γλυκ[ων?---

65. AHAT, outside a mosque by the river, below the acropolis. Marble homas with omphaloid top; broken above, buried below. H. 110 plus, w. 50, 39, -, th. 49, 38, -, lett. 2.7 - 5.0. On

the right side, large hammer and two chisels (?) in relief;
on the left side, chisel (?), leather-knife (cf. no.63) and
awl; on the back, mirror, comb, spindle and distaff. Pl. 12 .

ἔτους τδ'

Αῦρ. Τρυ-
φων Διογε-
νου ζῶν ἐ-

5. αὐτῶ καὶ τῇ
γλυκυτάτῃ
γυνδικί Ἀμ-
μίδ καὶ τοῖς
τεκνοῖς κα-

10. τεσ(σ)κενδ-
σεν μνήμης
χάριν

Date A.D. 216/7.

66. KĪZĪLCA SÜĞÜT, in the courtyard of the mosque. Marble bomos,
broken above. H. 41 plus, w. -, 29-31, 35, th. -, 28-31, 35,
lett. 1.6 - 2.8. On the left side, in relief, tongs, hammer and
anvil; on the right, mirror and ll. 7-13 of the inscription;
on the back, spindle, distaff and comb. Pl. P₂ .

[Α]ῦρ. Ἀμμ[ιδ]

ζῶσφι
Ἀλεξάνδ-
ρω καὶ

5. θυγατρὶ
Ἀφφιδ συν τῷ
ζῶσφι αὐτῆς

Διοσωρω
 κδι τῶ πα-
 10. ιδι ω δὲ-
 των μνη-
 μης χάριν
 ἐπὶ ἡσ

67. KARLIK, in a gravel pit (ancient cemetery) at the top of the village. Crystalline grey marble block with decoration of doorstone type on the front. The latter part of the inscription is contained in a panel, below which is a comb in relief. H. 102, w. 142, th. 45, lett. 1.5 - 3.0 Pl. P₂ .

I, in a single line below the pediment.

ἐτους τβ' μη(νος) Πάνημου Ἰκίουλιος Ἀρουντίου μετὰ τῶν

II. Above the panel

ἀδελφῶν μου
 ἀνεστησάν τῶ

III. In the panel.

<τω> πατρι

5. Ἀρουντί-
 ω κδι τῇ

μάμμη
 ἡμῶν
 Ἰουλεία

10. μνήμης
 χάριν.

Date A.D. 218, May/June.

68. KARLIK, in the wall of a house; irregular block of local brown tufa, possibly complete. H. 25, w. 64, th. 21 plus, lett. 2.5 - 5.0. Pl. 12 .

ΟΔΕ ΠΙΘΑΨΙΝΑ [-] ΓΙΣ
ΕΠΟΠΗΧΟΒΤΟΥΤΗΣ

Apparently an illiterate version of a fine or curse formula.

69. ÇARIK KÜYÜ, in a fountain on the N side of the village. Triple doorstone of grey marble. H. 84, w. 221, th. 30, lett. 1.5 - 2.0. The spandrels and lateral pilasters are covered with acanthus scroll-work. In the pediments; 1) eagle, 2) basket and vase, 3) lion. Each of the doors has a key-plate in the upper right panel and a lozenge, enclosing a circular object (patera?) in both lower panels. The upper left panels contain respectively; 1) stilus-case, 2) mirror, 3) four-petalled flower. The inscription runs round the arch of the left door-pediment and finishes on the capital immediately to the right of it. Pls. 12, P2.

Ἀδμοκράτης καὶ Ἀρμυῖα Φιλίππῳ εὐὼ μνημῆ[ς Χ]αρίν.

70. MESUDIYE (Gâvur Üreni), in the stairs of a house in the upper part of the village. Greyish-white marble stele, broken above, buried right, damaged below. H. 79 plus, w. -, 51, 57, th. -, 21, 23, lett. 2.3 - 3.0. Pl. 12 .

Ἀδυσδικη Γ[αίω]
ἀδελφῶ μ[νήμης]
χαρίν ἡσ[α] [ντι ἐτη κ']
ἐτελευτᾷ ἐ[τους τ' μ]η(νος)
5. Ἀυστρο[ν]

Restoration exempli gratia.

71. CARİK KÜYÜ, in front of the mosque. Grey marble quadruple doorstone, broken below. The lower part (H. 59 plus), lay nearby, thickly encrusted with modern mortar. H. 48 plus, w. 202, th. 38, lett. 3.5. In the spandrels of the arched pediments; 1) palmette acroterion, 2) vine or ivy plant growing from cauliculus, with flowers at ends of the lateral branches, 3) chalice, 4) as 2, but the flower on the left branch is replaced by a small Maltese cross, 5) hidden by modern mortar. In the pediments; 1) and 2) mirror and other objects, 3) -, 4) wheel with six spokes, or perhaps Constantinianum. Pl. 12 .

[ἡ δεινὰ τοῦ δεινὸς ἐδν] τῇ καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ Ασκλητῇ καὶ Στ[ρατονέ]
ικῇ καὶ Ἀβδοκάντῳ τῷ ἰν[ω]

The decoration strongly suggests Christianity, the names not necessarily so.

72. KIZILCA SÜĞÜT, in the courtyard of the mosque. White marble bomos, H. 66, w. 36, 30-33, 40, th. 36, 30-32, 40, lett. 2.4 - 2.6. On the left side, raised hand supporting scroll; on the back, raised hand supporting wreath. Pl. 12 .

leaf. ἐτ[ο]υς τλη'
Αἰρ. ἰον[λίο]ς Ω
π[.....]α
[.....]βε-
5. ρονεικιδν[η] καὶ
τω γλυκυτάτω
μου τέκνω Σεβη-
ρω καὶ Μουνδανῇ

νυμφη νυμφης Χά-
10. ριν Χρειστιδνοί.

The Montanist character of this text, already suggested by the Χρειστιδνοί of line 10, is confirmed by the name Μοννδονή (Montana) in line 8; see p. 75, n. 2.

Date A.D. 253/4.

73. ÇARIK KÜYÜ, in a fountain. Whitish marble doorstone, with tabula ansata above an undecorated door. H. 113, w. 81, th. 24, lett. 2.2 - 3.0. Pl. 12.

Θεοδωρον leaf.

Χρειστιδνοῦ

νυμφης [Χ]ρίν

Published, Inscr. Bur. p. 34, no. 61; Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, xiii, 2, 1929, p. 267 ~~no.~~ (as "probably Montanist").

74. BANAZ KÜYÜ, in a house. Head of a lion in white marble, bored for use as the spout of a fountain. The inscription runs across the forehead; broken below and behind. H. 30 plus, w. 32, th. 37 lett. 1 - 2.2. Pls 13, P3.

ὑπὲρ εὐχης Κοσταν-
τινου προσμονος.

1.2 Presumably for προσμοναρίου.

75. AHAT, near the school. Marble slab with moulded border and relief of Pan, holding curved stick in his right hand and one end of a large garland in his left. Broken below and right. H. 37, w. 43, th. 4, uninscribed. Pl. P3.

PHRYGIA PACATIANA

The Moxeanoi

Coins of the Moxeanoi (HN(2) pp. 671, 685) show them to have had at least two cities, Diokleia and Siokharax. The first of these appears also in inscription 76 found at Doğla (Tola in MAMA, Dolay on the Turkish map), which obviously retains the ancient name. As has been pointed out before, (CB ii, p.642; MAMA vi, pp. xvii f.), no remains of a city have been seen at Doğla. Ahırhisar (MAMA loc. cit.) 6 km. NE of Doğla, was certainly a place of some importance in Phrygian times, but there is little or no trace of Roman occupation; the exact site of Diokleia therefore remains uncertain, though the probability is on the side of Doğla as the Roman period site.

The territory of the Moxeanoi is shown by Ptolemy (V,2,18, cf. CB ii, pp. 664 f.) and by the inscription at Doğla to have covered most of the hilly area between the Banaz, Sandıklı, Sıncanlı and Küçük Sıncanlı Plains. The order given by Hierocles (668) puts Siokharax between Alia and Diokleia, suggesting that it should be looked for to the N or W of Doğla rather than to the S or E. This probably rules out the otherwise unidentifiable bishopric suggested at Yanık Ören (p. 81), but accords well enough with Ramsay's tentative location of Siokharax at Oturak (CB ii, p. 633).

Other sites probably belonging to the Moxeanoi include; 1) an ancient village 1 km. SE of the modern Kılter; 2) a site

1.5 km. NNW of Yavaşlar with many Roman or Byzantine tiles but no pottery, which may have been the site of the church from which inscription no. 78 and a capital accompanying it were obtained; 3) a fort of unsquared stones on top of a hill about 1 km. SW of Yavaşlar (not visited); 4) remains of a small farm on a ridge 1 km. SE of Devlet Han (Dolatann in CB), with numerous stones, including the winch-stone of a wine-press (cf. Studia Pontica i , p. 15) and fragments of large pithoi. The two estates mentioned in no. 77 , were presumably also in this area.

The MoxeanoiInscriptions

76. DOĞLA, in a fountain (Yeni Çesme) 1 km. WSW of the village. Whitish marble block, originally the shaft of a large base, complete. H. 94, w. 54, th. 46, lett. 2.5 - 3.5 with exceptions.

[Αυτοκράτορα]

[καίσαρα λευ]

κιοι Σεπτίμιον

Σευηρον Περτι-

5. νδκδ Σδρμδτικον Γερ-

μδνικον Βρεταννικον

Σεβδστον νεον ήλιον

ή προκεκριμενη του Μοξε-

δνων δήμου Διοκλειδ

10. ανδοτησαντων παρ' έ-

αυτων Κ. Πετρωνιου Κδ-

πιτωνος Εγνδτιδνου υπερ

του υιου Μαρκου και Ρουφου Ρου-

φριου Κρισπου και Φιλδδελφου

15. Δημητριον γραμματευ-

οντος του δήμου

Μαρκου β' του Ουδ-

λεριου έτους σπδ'.

11. 5 f. On the confusion of Severus' titles with those of Commodus, see CB, loc. cit. infra.

1.9 On the position of Diokleia, see above, p. 58.

Date A.D. 196/7.

Published JHS iv, 1883, p. 422, no. 34; CB ii, no. 615;

IGR iv, no. 664.

77. KILTER, in a fountain about 1 km. from the village, on the track to Yavaşlar. Marble slab or block, probably broken above and below, chipped left and right. H. 38 plus, w. 56, th. -, lett. 1.7 - 2.0. Pl. 12 .

[...]Ω[...?Σουλ]πικιδνου ὡς τῶν [χωρι-]

ων τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ μάλιστα Ζ[-]

μου καὶ Μεδιλου ἐνοχλουμένων ὑπο

στρατιωτων καὶ ὑπογραφην τὴν ὑποχ[ε]

5. γραμμένην. ὁ ἀξιολογώτατος Αἰγυ[λος?]

μη ἐπηρεάζεσθαι σου τὰ χωρία κατὰ [μη]

δεῦρ' τροπὸν φ[ρο]ντισει. του αὐτοῦ δε

ὁ ἀξιολογώτα[τ]ος χειλιάρχος προνο[ιδ]

ποιήσεται. ἂν οὖν τις τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοί τ[ε]

10. τειμένων στρατιωτων διδπορευομ[ε]

νος τὰ του δεσπότη σου χωρία ἢ τοιο[υ]

(?)τον δὲ τῶν ἢ ἀριστον ἢ δειπνον ἢ εἴ τι ἄλλο

τοιοῦτο ἐνοχλήσῃ ὅπερ ὁ τε λαμπρότα

τος [ἀνθυπάτος ? - - - -]

The general situation is clear. The manager of some estates has complained of trespassing and various unauthorised exactions by some soldiers, presumably belonging to the auxiliary cohort stationed at Eumeneia (p.5,n.1). The inscription gives the text

of a rescript, presumably from the governor of Asia or his legate, beginning (ll. 1-4) with a brief statement of the circumstances and continuing with an injunction (ἐπιτογὰς). Αἰγυ[λος?], presumably a procurator or other official, shall take steps to prevent any further trespass or damage; the commander of the cohort receives more detailed orders to restrain his men from exacting free meals or other perquisites which the proconsul (?) has not authorised (?).

1.1 The syntax is very uncertain but it is not improbable that the name is that of the magistrate to whom the complaint was addressed. T. Flavius Sulpicianus, proconsul of Asia under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus (PIR (2) iii, p.173, no. 373), is thus just possible.

ll. 13-14 ἀδμοποιδες probably refers to the proconsul, who may have laid down some definite rules on the conduct of the troops.

78. YAVASLAR, in the wall of a sugar-mill. White Dokimian marble lintel probably from an iconostasis (cf. MAMA iv, no.40), broken left and right. H. 15, w. 0.33 plus, th. 9 plus, lett. (I) 1-2, (II) 1. In a circular medallion (diam. 12.5), incised portrait of beardless saint with large nimbus, holding a book in his right hand. Pl. 12 .

I) on the fillet above the medallion.

ὑπερ ἐνχ[η]ς μάλιστα Αἰωντος (i.e. Αἰωντος)

II) in the medallion.

ὁ Ἀ(γίος) Φιλίππος

Here, as in no. 90, μάλιστα is probably a master-mason (Du Cange col. 845)

PHRYGIA PACATIANA

Kidyessos and Aristion

Kidyessos is well known from coins (HN (2), p. 670) and other sources (RE s.v. Kidyessos). Ramsay's discovery of a very battered dedication bearing the name of the city, at Bulca in the NE Sincanlı Ova (JHS viii, 1887, p. 467; CB ii, no. 625) is now confirmed by a milestone giving the name and a distance of 1 m.p. and by the epitaph of some members of the family Peinarii, which is connected with Kidyessos by its coins. Both these inscriptions were found at Bal Mahmut, 2 km. NE of Bulca (nos. 79, 81).

It was thus certainly situated near the NE corner of the Sincanlı (Sığanlı) Ova. The exact site remains somewhat doubtful, but the following locations are possible.

1) Gökçe Hüyük (officially Küçük Hk., locally pronounced Güçyüyük). A very large mound, marked Mani Hk. on the Turkish map, 2 km. ENE of the village, is pre-Roman, the surface pottery being exclusively Iron Age. Just outside the village, however, there are remains of ancient occupation, with late Roman and early Byzantine pottery as well as what is said to be the site of the church where a large Byzantine capital now in the village was found. The extent of the site could not be determined owing to growing crops, but the pottery was of poor quality.

2) At Bal Mahmut itself, on the hillside just above the village, there are two enormous stones (one 240 x 114 x 42), with holes for iron cramps of the usual Roman type, indicating that

they formed part of a building. The ground around them shows signs of occupation including a certain amount of Roman pottery.

3) 200m. NE of Bal Mahmut station and about 2 km. NE of the village, is a Roman and Byzantine site about 100 m. in diameter, with a rather regular pattern of robber-trenches. A short distance down the railway in the direction of Afyon is a cliff with tombs cut in it (not visited).

None of these three sites has the appearance of an ancient city, but the presence of the inscriptions and of a marble water-pipe from an aqueduct suggests that Kidyessos was situated at Bal Mahmut rather than at Gökçe Hk. (but see below, under Aristion). Bal Mahmut is conveniently situated in a gap in the hills leading down to the Araplı Dere (headwaters of the Kaystros) which provides easy access to both the plain of Afyon and the upper Tembris valley. The road Nakoleia - Konne - Eukarpia - Eumeneia, shown on the Peutinger Table, to which the Kidyessos milestone must have belonged, probably passed through this gap.

Aristion; this town, of which neither coins or inscriptions are known, poses a more difficult problem. Hierocles (668) gives it in Pacatiana, between Diokleia and Kidyessos, and this is virtually the only key to its position. It was apparently of no importance until the Byzantine period. As Ramsay pointed out (CB ii, pp. 633 f.) the Sincanlı Ova was more capable of supporting a second bishopric than the mountainous country of the Moxeanoi a third. There are a number of sites in the Sincanlı Ova that might qualify for the name of Ariston.

1) Karacaören. An Iron Age, Roman and Byzantine site in flat ground about 2 km. SE of the village of the same name,

covering a low mound about 100 m. in diameter and spreading over the adjoining fields. There are a few inscriptions in the villages round about (CB ii, nos. 622 ff., below nos. 83, 84).

2) Çayhisar. Fortified site on hill just opposite (NW of) the village, with good quality Iron Age, Roman and early Byzantine pottery. Recent digging has produced several fine decorated and inscribed stones, probably all from a church (nos. 85, 86, 93, 94).

3) Akçaşar; Iron Age, Roman and Byzantine site to the E of the village; extent uncertain on account of growing crops. Three Byzantine inscriptions in the village (nos. 87-89).

Of the three sites, Çayhisar appears on the evidence of its remains to be the most likely site for Aristion. The soil is also more fertile in this part of the plain than at the west end. Two inscriptions of obviously civic character, one at Kırka (CB ii, no. 626; IGR iv, no. 668) and one at Sinan Paşa (below, no. 80), may well belong to Aristion, if the latter was at Çayhisar, and already had the status of a city in the Roman period. If on the other hand Aristion was further to the W, or was not a pre-Byzantine city, they must be ascribed to Kidyessos, in which case the latter should probably be located at Gökçe Hk. rather than at Bal Mahmut.

Other sites in Sıncanlı Ova. 1) Saraycık Alanı, a small site in the hills about 6 km. SE of Kırka, with Iron Age to Byzantine pottery and remains of a small vaulted brick and stone building*, probably Byzantine rather than early Turkish, as there is no sign of glazed pottery in the vicinity. 2) A church near Sultan Boyalı is mentioned in CB (ii, no. 671 bis); I have not succeeded in finding it. There are both a türbe and a medrese there (Pl. P3, B).

* Pl. P3, A.

Kidyessos and AristionInscriptions

79. BAL MAHMUT, in the yard of a house. Coarse breccia column, broken below. H. 120+, diam. 33, lett. 4-6. Pl. 13 .

ἀγλαθῇ Τυχῇ
 Αυτοκράτορι [---
 Γ(αίου?) [---
 [-----

5. [-----
 ἀπὸ Κισυησ[σου]
 μι(λιδ) δ'

It is uncertain whether ll. 3-5 have been worn away, erased, or were never inscribed at all. At the bottom of the preserved part of the shaft there are signs of an even more worn dedication, probably to the Tetrarchy. For the position of Kidyessos, see pp. 63f.

80. SINAN PAŞA, in the wall of the principal mosque. White marble fragment, broken all sides. H. 61, w. 41, th. -, lett. 2.9 - 3.2. Pl. 13 , from photograph only.

[...?] ἡμερ[α] ν[ε]ον ἡ[ρ]ωδ[ε]ς
 [σιδ] τ[ε]ς τοῦ γενο[υ]ς
 [αὐ] τοῦ ἀπὸ ἀνωθ[ε]ν
 [π]οτε ἀρχ[ε]ς τ[ε]ς

5. [π]ωτε νο[υ]ς κ[α]ι
 [λ]ε[ι]τουργ[ι]ς κ[α]ι δ[ι]α
 [ν]ο[υ]ς κ[α]ι σ[ε]ιτοδε[ι]α[ς]

[π]ερί την πατρίδα εὐ[ερ]-

[γ]εσιδς. τήν ἀνδρ[τ-]

10. [α]ιν τοῦ ἀνδριαντοῦ[s]
 ποιησάμενου Α[ύρ.]
 [λ]υκωνος β' τοῦ [έλ]
 [α]χιμον β[ο] [υλ]εῦ[του]

1.7 σείτομετρίδης would have suited the context better,
 but the reading, except in the last three letters, is certain.

81. BAL MAHMUT, built into a step in the vestibule of the mosque.
 White marble block, broken right, buried above and behind. H. 31
 plus, w. 172 plus, th. 20 plus, lett. 3.5 - 6.5. Pl. 13 .

[- - - - - ; - - - - -]

M. Peinario Gallo et P. Peinario Phront[oni]
 f(iliis) suis

[e]t[- - - -]e A.f. Proculai uxori suae [- - - - -]

5. h(oc) monumentum h(eredes) s(equetur) o(mnes?)

1.2 Flavius Peinarius, who was high priest at Kidyessos under
 Domitian, (BMC Phrygia, p. 150), was no doubt a relative, and
 may well have been a contemporary.

1.3 The gentile name of the wife has been erased. Such faint
 traces as remain are consistent with the reading given above.

82. TOKUŞLAR, in the wall of the cemetery. White marble bomos
 with omphaloid top, broken below. H. 67 plus, w. 33, 26-28, -,
 th. -, lett. 2.7 - 3. Pl. 13 , from impression only.

Αὐρ. Ζωτικός

Αἰνοπαππους

κε ἡ συνβιος δὲ-

τοῦ Αὐρ. Τάτιον
 5. τῇ θυγατρὶ Θεο-
 δούλῃ κ' τέκνῳ [ις]
 ζωτικῷ κ' [----]
 [-]ω μνήμ[ης]
 [χάριν]

83. GÜNEY, by the new mosque. Whitish Dokimian marble bomos, the lower end recut as a moulding, broken above. H. 74, w. -, 28-30, -, th. -, 27-28, -, lett. (I) 1.2 - 1.7, (II) 1.2 - 1.3. Pl. 14 .

I) On the front.

Ἀφφίδς Ἑρμῇ συνβι-
 ω ζωσά κ' ἐδυτῇ κ'
 τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῖς-
 σ τροφίμῳ κ' Ἑρμοῦ
 5. κ' Αὐξάνοντι τέκν[ο]-
 ις γλυκυτάτοις ἐπο[ι-]

II) On the left side.

Incised cross?

ἦσε μνήμης χάριν
 Χριστιανοί

Montanist (p. 74, n. 2).

84. GÜNEY, in a house in the lower mahalle. White marble slab, perhaps from the tympanum of a door; broken right. H. 87,

w. 57 plus, th. -, lett. 1-3. On the left, panel with a date palm incised in it; on the right, part of an arch supported on a column. The inscription runs down the moulding separating the two and along the edge below the panel. Pl. P3.

I) To right of panel.

ΣΩΑΕΗΙΟΥΩ , ὁγίος , ὁγίος , ὁγίος , κύριος Θεὸς ἐστρατιῶν ⁂

II) Below the panel.

ω Θεος βοηθος μ[- - - - -]

I. The letters at the beginning may be a quasi-magical formula. Then follows a quotation from the Sanctus (Epinikion), ending, apparently, in an abbreviation mark.

85. ÇAYHISAR, outside a house on the right bank of the stream. White Dokimian marble base or column-plinth, said to have been brought from the castle, inscribed on three sides; on the under surface is an incised circle, as a setting-mark; broken above and behind. H. 36 plus, w. -, 45, 51, th. -, 40 plus, 43 plus, lett. see below. Pl. 14 .

I) On the front. Lett. 4.5

μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός

II) On the left side. Lett. 1.8 - 2.1.

---]ΤΗ[---?---]ων

---]ΤΩ ῥυθεο πατρην

---]δε κελων πανυπερ

---]δ' ὁγαθων δ'εξη

5.---]υτος γε θελεις

III) On the right side. Lett. 2.0 - 3.1.

ἵπς τριβς νομμερῶν
 γεν(νδιων) ν' καὶ καθοοσιω[μ(ενων)]
 Κωνσταντίνων[ν]
 ἐξήμενος τῇ ἁγία
 5. Τριάδι ἀνεστίγη leaf

II appears to be in verse.

III, 1.1 Perhaps ἡριφύκτος or ἡριφύκσιος τριβουνος.

1.2 The reading of the first letter is certain. γεν(νδιων)? or an error for σεν(ιορων)? For καθοοσιωμ(ενων) cf. MAMA i, no. 169b.

86. ÇAYHISAR, in the same yard as no. 85. Lintel of greyish - white Dokimian marble, with mouldings above, below and left corresponding to those of no. 93. 10 cm. from the left end of the under surface is a dowel-hole for attachment to the jamb; the decoration of the main panel consists of an incised $\frac{3}{4}$ -length figure of a saint at the left end and busts of five others enclosed in circles; broken right. H. 19, w. 60 plus, th. 11.5, lett. 0.7 - 1.3. Pl. P3 .

Names of the saints, reading from left to right.

- 1) ὁ ἅγιος Ἀβερκίος
- 2) ὁ ἅγιος Πανσινδκος
- 3) ὁ ἅγιος Νικόλαος
- 4) ὁ ἅγιος Θεόδωρος
- 5) Μηχαὶλ
- 6) Μη(τη)ρ [Θ(εο)ν]

87. AKÇAŞAR, in the stairs leading to the roof of the mosque.

Limestone cornice or string-mould, broken left and right. H. 16, w. 76 plus, th. 29 plus, lett. 1.7 - 3.5. Pl. 13 .

?ἐγενοντο δι' κιο]ves ὑπερὶ εὐχῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου Θρε[πτοῦ]
 ---] ΑΑΡΥ κε πᾶντος τοῦ γένου(ς) δού[ου]

1.2 The first four letters are an abbreviation; Ἀλεξάνδρου ?

88. AKÇAŞAR, in the W wall of the mosque. Bluish-white crystalline marble lintel, probably from an iconostasis. Broken left and right. H. 14.5, w. 27 plus, th. 10 plus, lett. 1.7 - 2.3. Pl. 14 .

---] Νηκιφορου ὑπάρχου[---

The natural explanation of this inscription is that it gives a date by the consulate of Nekiphoros, probably the Emperor Nicephorus I (802-811), who appears to have been the last emperor to use the consulate as a means of indicating regnal years. It is however possible that the Nekiphoros of this inscription was one of the officials who acquired the right to use the consular title after the emperors had ceased to use it. (Grumel, Chronologie, pp. 346 f.)

Date A.D. 802-811?

89. AKÇAŞAR, in a lane. "Double column" of Byzantine type in local conglomerate, broken above and right. H. 120 plus, w. 60 plus, th. 22, lett. 4-7. Pl. 15 .

[Κυρίε βοηθί]

[?Γρη]γορου
 του γραψάν-
 του ναε.

5. cross Κυριε βο-

ήθι τω

προσυκφ

ⲙⲉⲟⲟⲟⲱ

1.7 For προσικου; cf. ὕκου in no. 90, 1.8

90. ϞOBANÜZÜ, in the wall of the mosque. Yellowish sandstone block or slab, broken left and right. H. 96, w. 86+, th. -, lett. 3.5 - 5.5. Pl. 15 .

ⲙⲉⲟⲟⲟⲱ προ-

νυδ διδ του

ἀρχαγγελου

Μιχαηλ ἐγενετο το

5. ἔργον ἐπὶ Ὑσυχίου ἐβλ[αβ(εστιδτου)?]

[προκαθ]ήμενω μηνι πρωτ(ω) ἐνδι(κτιωνος) δι

περι εὐχης Τροφίμου Τρο[-----

---]υ κε παντος τοῦ ὕκου[αὐτοῦ]

---]εὐλογια πδοση τῇ ἐκκλησια

10. ἀμην ^{vac.}

[εὐλογ]ιδ μαρίστορι Ζω[σιμω?]

ἀμ]ην ^{vac.}

The exact amount missing at either side is uncertain, as the stone was probably always of irregular shape.

11. 5-6 The distinction between genitive and dative was often not appreciated by Byzantine lapicides.

11. 9-12 Probably to be understood as a blessing on the congregation that had subscribed the funds and on the master-mason (cf. no. 78) who had been responsible for the building

of the church.

91. ÇOBANÖZÜ, in the wall of the mosque. Block or slab of yellowish limestone with rough geometrical design, broken right; not measured. Pl. 15, not to scale.

ἐγένετο τὸ ἔργον ἐπ[ι]...

92. BAL MAHMUT, in the wall of a house. Grey trachyte block with large incised cross. H. 62, w. 75, th. 69, lett. 2-5. Pl. 15.

cross ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχῆς κ[αὶ]
σωτηρίας Εὐγε-
νου Κονοῦ ἀμην cross

93. ÇAYHISAR, in the same yard as no. 85; said to be from the castle. Greyish-white Dokimian marble pilaster, moulded at the edges and decorated down the centre with a panel of vine-scroll filled with birds and beasts in relief. The sides and back are carefully dressed, and one side has a rebate for a slab, showing that the pilaster was originally part of a screen or iconostasis (cf. no. 86). Broken above and below. H. 58 plus, w. 16, th. 11, uninscribed. Pl. P₃.

94. ÇAYHISAR, in the same yard as no. 85. White Dokimian marble Ionic capital and base, said to have been brought from the castle opposite. Capital; h. 21, w. 55-43, th. 44. Base; h. 21.5, w. & th. 45-49. The numerous other stones in the same yard, said to be from the same source, suggest that the capital and base had been reused in a church. Pl. P₃.

PHRYGIA PACATIANA(?)

The Lykaones

Ramsay's placing of the Lykaones in the mountainous area S of Sıncanlı Ova and N of the Pentapolis (CB ii, pp. 664 f., 693 f.) seems convincing in spite of the necessity of rearranging the text of Ptolemy. More field-work is needed in the Küçük Sıncanlı Ova. There is no reason for attributing the Monastery of the Lykaones to this area rather than to Constantinople (R. Janin, Geographie Ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin, Pt. I, vol. iii, Paris 1953, pp. 323 f.).

PHRYGIA PACATIANA

Pepouza

Before leaving Phrygia Pacatiana for good, it is impossible to avoid mentioning the problem of Pepouza⁽¹⁾. Robert's rearrangement of Atyokhorion and Dionysopolis (Villes d'Asie Mineure, pp. 127 ff.) has left little room for Pepouza at Bekilli. As was pointed out by Sir William Calder (Byzantion vi, 1931, p. 425), there is no evidence for Montanism in the area of Karbasan and Karahallı, further to the east, and Pepouza

cannot be put there, as suggested in CB ii, p. 573, n.1.

Pepouza must be looked for in an area where Montanism was strong. Neglecting isolated examples, Montanist inscriptions (mainly epitaphs of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\delta\upsilon\iota$) are found in a belt running from the region of Bekirli approximately NNE via the middle Banaz Ova and the W end of the Sincanli Ova (one example at Güney, no. 83) to the upper valley of the Tembris. There was probably also a small colony of Montanists at Apameia⁽²⁾.

Hierocles' order (668) runs Eumeneia-Siblia-Pepouza-Bria-Sebaste, and if the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\delta\upsilon\iota$ inscriptions can be trusted as an indication of Montanist influence, the most likely positions for Pepouza, which will put it into the area where the inscriptions are known to be common without doing violence to Hierocles' order, are in the neighbourhood of Bekilli and the hilly area N of Sebaste, around Kızılcı Söğüt (nos. 30, 31, 72, 73); but there is an immense amount of almost completely unexplored country N of Bekilli and W of Sebaste, and it is probably here that Pepouza should be sought. The site at Yanık Üren (p. 81) which appears to have been a bishopric, fits Hierocles at least as well (except that it may have been over the border in Phrygia Salutaris) but has produced no epitaphs of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\delta\upsilon\iota$ and is some way from the area where they do occur.

NOTES

(1) The latest detailed discussion, by Ruge in RE, s.v. Pepouza, recapitulates previous theories but makes no constructive suggestions.

(2) Calder in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library vii, 3, 1923, pp. 1-46. More recent discoveries of inscriptions mentioning $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\delta\upsilon\iota$ include those in Byzantion vi, pp. 421 ff.; MAMA iv, no. 313; vi, nos. 234-6; above, nos. 30, 31, 72, 73, 83.

PHRYGIA SALUTARIS

The Pentapolis

The Pentapolis of Phrygia is known as such only from Byzantine sources (CB ii, p. 678; RE s.v. Pentapolis) but as the five cities of which it consisted, Eukarpia, Hieropolis, Otrous, Stektorion and Brouzos, had existed much earlier, the name also is doubtless pre-Byzantine. The area as a whole seems also to have been known as the Eukarpitikon (below, p.77).

The territory of the Pentapolis is a plain, the modern Sandıklı Ovası, well defined by mountains on all sides. On the W it is divided from the upper valley of the Maeander by Ak Dağı (2449 m.) and from the plain of Sebaste by Burgaz Dağı (1990m.). On the E, the long range of Kumalar Dağı (2250 m.) cuts it off from the plains of Synnada and Metropolis. On the NW and N it is bounded by the hilly country inhabited in antiquity by the Moxeanoi and (?) the Lykaones, while on the S a low pass leads over to the plain of Aurokra and to Apameia.

The Peutinger Table shows a road running from Dorylaion to the upper Maeander Valley, via Nakoleia-Konna-Eukarpia and Eumeneia. This road must have passed through Kidyessos (p.64) and the Küçük Sıncanlı Ova and along the NW edge of the Pentapolis to Eukarpia, which was probably at Emirhisar (below, p.78). From Eukarpia to Eumeneia the only practicable route runs down the valley of the Kufi Çay, between Ak Dağı and Burgaz Dağı. The distance is, as pointed out in CB (ii, p. 691) nearer to xxv m.p. than to the xxx given by the Table.

It is probable that there was also a direct road from the Pentapolis to Apameia via the plain of Aurokra, but it is not likely to have been much used as ²through route. The rise of Afyon Karahisar at the expense of Synnada and Prymnessos has pushed the main line of NE-SW communication further towards the W, and the importance of the Afyon-Sandıklı-Dinar road has been further increased by the fact that Dinar was for some time the terminus of the railway up the Maeander and Lykos valleys.

The plain of the Pentapolis is divided into two parts; the northern half is a triangle about 25 km. from E to W and 20 from N to S. Sandıklı, which has been the administrative centre since Seljuk times, stands at the SE corner of this northern section. The southern part of the plain forms a rectangle 20 km. by 9, running SSW from Sandıklı.

The topography has been discussed at some length by Ruge in RE (especially s.vv. Otrous and Pentapolis, 2, also under the other cities). Otrous is the only one of the five cities that cannot be placed with reasonable certainty, in spite of their proximity to one another.

Eukarpia. That Eukarpia was the principal city of the area in Imperial times can be deduced from the coinage. Under Augustus, the only coins issued in the plain bore the legend ΕΥΚΑΡΠΗΤΙΚΟΥ (HN(2) p. 673), and the phrase τῶν ἐν [Ἐὺκ] [Εὐκ]-ἀρπετικῶν πόλεων is known from an inscription (AS vi, 1956, p. 49, no. 2), at Sandıklı.

Two epitaphs put up by ~~the~~ bouleutai of Eukarpia are known. The first of these (AS loc. cit. no. 1) is from Emircik in the territory of Eumeneia and obviously has no bearing on the location

of Eukarpia. The second (below, no. 110) is from Emirhisar, where it was said to have been excavated recently in the immediate vicinity of the village. The example of the Emircik text shows that this in itself is not enough to fix Eukarpia at Emirhisar; but the case for Emirhisar (CB ii, pp. 691 f.) was already fairly strong and the presence of the inscription strengthens it further.

Surface remains at Emirhisar are now confined to pottery and occasional blocks. In Hamilton's time (Researches ii, p. 169) numerous buildings were still standing.

The only real objection to Emirhisar as a site for Eukarpia is that it does not correspond to the distance from Eumeneia given by the Peutinger Table. Kīlandīras, suggested by Kiepert (FOA ix, text p. 7, n. 98; cf. RE s.v. Eukarpia) is not generally held to be an ancient site of any importance, and already has an ancient name (cf. Kelenderis, modern Gilindere, in Cilicia) of its own. The correctness of the Table's distances for this road can only be checked when either Konna or Eukarpia is located with certainty, but the overall distance of 92 m.p. from Dorylaion to Eukarpia is certainly 15-20 m.p. too short.

Hieropolis. The three known inscriptions that might fix the site (CB, ii, nos. 630, 656, 657) are widely distributed, though all were found in the N section of the plain. The first is from one of the three villages called Kuyucak, in the centre, the second from Kīlandīras in the extreme N and the third from the south edge at Hudai Hamam. If, as suggested in CB (ii, p. 680) the name Hieropolis in itself implies some striking natural feature such as hot springs (as it does in the case of Hierapolis

on the Lykos), this would tend to place it near the Hamam, probably at Koçhisar where there are various signs of ancient settlement including much surface pottery and the building described by Ramsay as a peripteral temple, a few blocks of which were still in position in 1955. This places it within a reasonable distance of the milestone recorded at Kuyucak (JHS iv, 1883, pp. 430 f., no. 41; CB ii, no. 630; IGR iv, no. 695) erected by the city of Hierapolis, with the distance m.p. i.

The Hamam, which lies about 4 km. SSW of Koçhisar, is said to be fed by twelve springs, of which one, needless to say, is claimed to be radioactive.

According to the Acta of St. Avircius, the stone that the saint used for his epitaph at Hieropolis (CB ii, no. 657) was brought from Rome by a devil cast out of the Emperor's daughter (JHS iv, 1883, p. 425); careful comparison of specimens of the native Hieropolitan rock with the epitaph itself, now in the Lateran Museum, shows this part of the story to be quite unfounded.

Brouzos. The site is fixed at Kara Sandıklı by no. 97, now confirmed by the epitaph of two Brouzenoi (no. 101), also at Kara Sandıklı. The site has been described by Ramsay in BCH vi, 1882, p. 504.

The classical doorway described and illustrated in CB (ii, pp. 683 ff.) is still standing, though the mosque of which it formed part has been rebuilt. The only evidence that the doorway is in situ is a piece of architrave projecting from an adjacent building which in all other respects appears to be modern (plan, pl. 16). Even if the door is in situ, there is no indication of the nature of the original building. It may

well have been a church, though the door itself is probably to be dated to the 2nd century A.D. (according to Mr. D.E. Strong, who adds that the mouldings on it (pl. P4, A-C) do not correspond to any of the normally recognised styles of that period). The marble is probably from Dokimion, which besides being the centre of the export trade in "Synnadic" purple-veined marble produced a considerable amount of grey and fine white marble for local use. The remains of arches within the building may be partly Byzantine, but are more likely to be Turkish (Pl. P4, C).

Stektorion. Stektorion lay between the modern villages of Menteş and Ala (Elli) Mescit, and its territory must have included most of the southern arm of the plain. The site is marked by a low but extensive mound known as Koca Hüyük; the walls mentioned in CB (ii, p. 689) are no longer visible, though the mound retains the characteristic sharp edge that indicates the former existence of fortifications. The Græco-Roman city extended over a considerable area beyond the mound. A dedication to Nerva (no. 96) assures the identification beyond doubt.

Immediately to the N of Menteş there is a small fort (plan, pl. 16) on a spur overlooking the plain. It has a double circuit of walls, with remains of a third, outer, circuit on the SE, where the slope is less steep than elsewhere, and on the SW, where the ground rises above the level of the fort. On this side there is also a tower,* apparently solid, incorporated in the inner ring of walls. The walls are about 120 cm. thick, built of irregular lumps of stone without mortar, and are preserved in places to shoulder-height. The only two pieces of pottery found were quite unidentifiable, and both the date

* Pl. P4, D, from south-west.

and the purpose of the fort remain obscure. It is however probably pre-Roman rather than Byzantine.

Otrous. The fifth city of the Pentapolis, Otrous, has still to be satisfactorily located. Three sites have to be considered.

1) Çorhisar, identified as Otrous in CB (ii, p. 687) is a low mound between Koçhisar and Emirhisar, partly occupied by a modern farm. The pottery is less rich than would be expected on a city site, and there are very few squared stones to be seen.

The inscription in honour of Alexander (IGR iv, no. 692) has, as pointed out by Ruge (RE s.v. Otrous, cols. 1885 f.), no certain connexion with Otrous.

2) Yanık Ören, between the modern villages of Otluk and Gürek, in the valley of the Kufi Çay that leads down towards Eumeneia, is a Byzantine site with traces of earlier occupation, but its situation in a narrow valley with little cultivable land is hardly consistent with that of a city. The epitaph of an 11th century bishop (no. 112) suggests that it was a bishopric, and if this is so it is more likely to be Otrous than, for example, Pezouza (p. 75) or Siokharax (p. 58). The site has been described by Hamilton (Researches, ii, p. 168). There is said to be a fort in the hills nearby, which I was unable to visit. A fragment of a Byzantine cross, originally decorated with enamelled medallions, and a clay aqueduct-pipe (cf. Pergamon I, text iii, beibl. 96) were among objects recently dug up (pl. 16). The name Otluk is a Turkish word and unlikely to have been derived from Otrous.

3) Sandıklı. The Germiyanid castle, built in 1324 (I.H. Uzunçarşılıoğlu, Kütahya Sehri, Istanbul 1932, pp. 73 f.) stands

on a mound which appears at a distance to be partly artificial. I regret not having examined it more closely, but if it should prove to be an ancient site inhabited in the Roman period, it may well be Otrous. Hamilton (Researches ii, p. 170) expresses doubts of its antiquity, though perhaps having just visited the exceptionally well preserved site at Emirhisar, he had come to expect too much.

None of ^{these} three sites is entirely satisfactory; as has been pointed out by Ruge in his exhaustive summary of the evidence (RE s.v. Otrus col. 1888), the only inscription (IGR iv, no. 693) that appears to mention Otrous is of quite uncertain provenance; it is built into the mosque at Kilandiras with another (IGR iv, no. 694) which certainly belongs to Hieropolis, and both are therefore suspect (see above, under Hieropolis). Only the discovery of more definite epigraphic evidence will settle the question.

The Pentapolis

Inscriptions

95. SANDIKLI, in a fountain (Uç Kurnali Çesme). Greyish white marble block, cut away on left, chipped above and right. H. 109, w. 44 plus, th. 53, lett. 0.6 - 1.2. Ruled horizontal guide-lines. Pls. 17, P₄

Column I

frumenti	κ.Μο.ι * c/	I 1
hordei	κ.Μο.ι * lx/	
centenum sive sicale	κ.Μο.ι * lx/	
mili pis/ ti	κ.Μο.ι * c/	
5. mili in/ tegri	(κ.Μο.ι) * 1	5
panicii/	κ.Μο.ι * 1	
spel/ te munde	κ.Μο.ι * c	
sca/ ndulae sive spelte	κ.Μο.ι * xxx	
fab/ e/ p/ re/ se/	κ.Μο.ι * c	
10. fab/ e non prese	κ.Μο.ι * lx	10
le/ nticle	κ.Μο.ι * c	
he/ rbilie	κ.Μο.ι * lxxx	
pi/ se fracte	κ.Μο.ι * c	
pi/ se non fracte	κ.Μο.ι * lx	
15. ci/ ceris	κ.Μο.ι * c	15
h/ ervi	κ.Μο.ι * c	
a/ bene	κ.Μο.ι * xxx	
f/ aeni greci	κ.Μο.ι * c	
l/ upini c/ r/ udi	κ.Μο.ι * lx	

Column I

20.	[l]upini cocti	⊗ Ital.i * iiii	I 20
	[f]asioli sicci	⊗ Mo.i * c	
	[li]ni seminis	⊗ Mo.i * cl	
	[o]rile munde	⊗ Mo.i * cc	
	[ti]sane munde	⊗ Mo.i * c	
25.	[a]lice munde	⊗ Mo.i * cc	25
	[ses]ami	⊗ Mo.i * cc	
	[fae]ni seminis	⊗ Mo.i * xxx	
	[Ma]edice seminis	⊗ Mo.i * cl	
	[ca]nabis seminis	⊗ Mo.i * lxxx	
30.	[bi]cie sicce	⊗ Mo.i * lxxx	30
	[pa]paveris	⊗ Mo.i * cl	
	[cy]mini mundi	⊗ Mo.i * cc	
	[se]minis rafanini	⊗ Mo.i * (c)l	
	[si]napis	⊗ Mo.i * cl	
35.	[si]napis confecte	⊗ i * viii	35
	[ite]m vini Piccni	⊗ Ital.i * xxx	II 1, la
	[Ti]bortini	⊗ Ital. [l] * xxx	
	[Sa]bini	⊗ Ital.i * xxx	
	[A]minnei	⊗ Ital.i * xxx	
40.	[Sa]iti	⊗ Ital.i * xxx	5
	[Su]rrentini	⊗ Ital.i * xxx	
	[Fa]lerni	⊗ Ital.i * xxx	
	[item]vini veteris		
	[pri]mi gustus	⊗ Ital.i * xxiiii	
45.	[vin]i veteris se [q] (uentis) gu(stus)	⊗ i * xvi	
	[vin]i rustici	⊗ Ital.i * viii	10
	[cer]vesiae sive cami	⊗ It. i * iiii	
	[zyt]hi	⊗ It. i * i	

	[item] carveni Meonii	⊕ It.	i * xxx	
50.	[chr]usattic[i]	⊕ It.	i * xxiiii	
	[dec]octi	⊕ It.	i * xvi	15
	[def]riti	⊕ It.	i * xx	
	[con]diti	⊕ It.	i * xxiiii	
	[aps]inthii	⊕ It.	i * xx	
55.	[rhos]ati	⊕ It.	i * xx	
	[Item] olei			III 1
	[olei] floris	⊕ It.	i * xl	1 a
	[olei] s[e]quentis	⊕ It.	i * xxiiii	
	[olei] c[ibari]	⊕ It.	i * xii	
60.	[olei] r[afanini]	⊕ It.	i * viii	
	[aceti]	⊕ It.	i * vi	5
	[liqua]minis primi	⊕ It.	i * xvi	
	[liqua]minis secu(ndi)	⊕	i * xii	
	[salis]	* mo.	i * c	
65.	[salis] conditi	⊕ It.	i * viii	
	[melli]s optimi	⊕ It.	i * xl	10
	[mellis] secundi	⊕ It.	i * xx [iiii]	
	[mellis] foenicini	⊕ It.	i * viii	
	[item] car[nis]			IV 1
70.	[carni]s porcine	It.po.	i * xii	1 a
	[carni]s bubule	It.po.	i * viii	
	[carni]s caprine sive verbecine	It.po.	i * viii	
	[bulba]e	It.po.	i * xxiiii	
75.	[sumin]is	It.po.	i * xx	5
	[ficati] optimi	It.po.	i * xvi	

	[larid]i optimi	It.po.	i * xvi
	[perna]e optime ^u petaso-		
	[nis siv]e Venapicae		
80.	[vel Ce]rditane	It.po.	i * xx
	[Marsic]ae	It.po.	i * xx

Column II

	[adipis recentis	It.po.	i * xlii?] IV	10
	[axungiae	It.po.	i * xli]	
	[ungellas quattuor et aqualiculum]			
	[eodem] pr [etio quo car-]			
5.	[o] distrahitur			
	isicium porci[num	unciae	i * ii]	
	isicia [b]ubul[a	It.po.	i * x]	
	Lucanicarum	[It.po.	i * xvi]	15
	Lucanicarum [bubula-]			
10.	vac rum	It./po.	i * x]	
	fasianus past[us		* ccl]	
	fasianus agres[tis		* cxxv]	
	fasiana pasta		[* cc]	
	fasiana non past[a		* c]	20
15.	anser pastus		[* cc]	
	anser n(on) pastus		[* c]	
	pullorum	par	i/[* lx]	
	pedix	unus	* [xxx]	

Column II

	turtur pingu(i)s		[x̄ xvi]	IV 25
20.	turtur agrest[is]	unus	* xii]	
	turdorum	decuria	[x̄ lx]	
	palumborum	par	* [xx]	
	columbinorum	par	* [xxiiii]	
	attagena		* xx	30
25.	anatum	par	* xl	
	lepus		* cl	
	cuniculus		* xl	
	ampeliones ping(ues)	n.x	* [xl]	
	agrestes	n.x	* x/x]	35
30.	ficedulae	n.x.	* xl	
	passeres	n.x	* xv/i]	
	glires	n.x	* xl	
	pavus masculus		* ccc	
	femina		* cc	40
35.	coturnices	no.x	* xx	
	sturni	no.x	* xx	
	aprunae	It.po.	i * xvi	
	cervinae	It.po.	i * xii	
	dorci sive capreae vel			
40.	dammae	It.po.	i * x/ii]	45
	porc[e]lli lactantes	<u>vac.</u>		
	<u>vac.</u>	in po.	i * xvi	
	agnus	in po.	i * xii	
	haedus	in po.	i * xii	
45.	sebi	It.po.	i * vi	
	buturi	It.po.	i * xvi	50

	[i]tem piscis			V 1
	piscis aspratilis ma-			
	rini	It.po.	i * xxiii/i	1 a
50.	piscis secundi	It.po.	i * [xvi]	
	pis(cis) flubialis optim/i		<u>vac.</u>	
	<u>vac.</u>	It.po.	i * xii	
	piscis secu(ndi) flub(ialis)	po.	* vi/[ii]	
	piscis salsi	It.po.	i * vi	5
55.	ostriae	no.c	* c	
	echini	no.c	* l	
	echini recentis pur-			
	gati	⊕ It.	i * l	
	echini salsi	⊕ It.	i * c	
60.	sphonduli marini		<u>vac.</u>	
	<u>vac.</u>	num.c	* l	10
	intiba optim(a)	nu.x	* x	VI 3
	sequentia	nu.x	* iiii	
	malbae maxi(mae)	nu.v	* iiii	5
65.	malbae seq(uentes)	nu.x	* iiii	
	lactucae opti(mae)	nu.v	* iiii	
	sequentes	nu.x	* iiii	
	coliculi opt(imi)	nu.v	* iiii	
	sequentes	nu.x	* iiii	10
70.	cumae opt(imae)	fasce(m)	i * iii/i	
	porri maximi	nu.x	* i/[iii]	
	sequentes	nu.xx	* ii/[ii]	
	betae maxime	nu.v	* iii/i	
	sequent[es]	nu.x	X iii/i	15

This long and well preserved fragment of the Edict of Diocletian is principally remarkable for adding virtually nothing to the established text (E.R. Graser's revision of Mommsen and Blümner's text, ESAR v, 1940, pp. 307 ff.).

It does however confirm a number of points where the established text has been restored from the parallel Greek text, and repairs one or two omissions.

Col. I, ll. 9-25 (ESAR I, 9-25). The measures are given, as in the Greek text. In the Stratonikeia text they are omitted.

Col. I, ll. 23-25 (I, 23-25). Confirms the restoration based on the Greek.

Col. II, ll. 28-32 (IV 34-38). Confirms the restoration from the Greek.

Variant readings.

Col. II, ll. 19 & 28 (IV, 25 & 34). The use of ping^u(i)s instead of singularis is an interesting variant and provides a better equivalent to the $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\lambda$ of the Greek, as well as a better antithesis to agrestis. Singularis is given in both the Stratonikeia and Bargylia texts.

Col. II, l. 41 (IV, 46). Porcelli lactantes, nominative plural, is perhaps preferable, in view of what follows, to the lactantis of the established text.

Col. II, l. 47 (V, 1). Piscis, genitive, is probably better than pisces of the established text. The headings of sections 3 & 4 are given in the genitive.

Col. II, l. 54 (V, 5) Piscis salsi, preferable to the

piscisalsi of the established text (based here on both Strat. & Barg.)

Orthography.

In minor points of spelling, there is little to choose between the Sandikli text and those from Stratonikeia, Bargylia and Apollonia, which are the only ones relevant to these sections of the Edict.

The Sandikli text is much more inclined to use e for ae in the feminine genitive singular and elsewhere, but is rather more classical in its use of b and v. For example; Col. I, 1.72, sive (Strat. sibe), Col. II, 1.33, pavus (Strat. pa/bus), Col. II, 1.38, cervinae (Strat. cerbinae), Col. II, 1.45, sebi (Strat. & Barg., sevi); on the other hand Col. I, 1.17, a/bene (Strat. avenae).

Errors.

Other variations from the previously recorded texts are due to the errors of the lapicide or scribe, as opposed to differences of opinion as to the spelling of Latin words at a time when this was in any case somewhat fluid. These include; Col. I, 1.10, Prese for frese, Col. I, 1.23, o/rile for orize, Col. I, 1.36, Piceni for Piceni, Col. I, 1.37 Ti/bortini for Tiburtini, Col. I, 1.49, carveni for caroeni, Col. I, 11.79-80, Venapicae for Menapicae, Ce/rditane for Cerretane, Col. II, 1.18, pedix for perdix, Col. II, 1.19, pingus for pinguis.

Col. I, 1.33 (I, 33). The difference in price, 50 denarii as against the 150 of the established text, is certainly due to

a mistake; the Greek text and probably the Apollonia fragment give 150.

Abbreviations.

There are rather more abbreviations in this than in other Latin texts of the Edict. The peculiarity of having the prices in figures, instead of in words, is shared by only the Aizanoi and Synnada (JRS xlii, 1952, pp. 72 ff.) texts.

Date A.D. 301.

96. MENTES, low down in the W corner of the Tekke. Limestone block without mouldings, buried below. H. 48 plus, w. 58, th. 55, lett. 4.2 - 5.5. Pl. 17.

Imp. Nerva Cae/s/

Aug. pont. max.

trib. pot. p.p. iii

cos. civitas

5. vac. Stectoren(orum)

Date A.D. 97 (January to September) On Stektorion, see pp.

Published CB ii, no. 640, CIL III 12238.

97. KARA SANDIKLI, outside the mosque. Plain shaft of greyish-white marble base; the upper and lower mouldings were on separate blocks. H. 90, w. 55, th. 50, lett. 3. Pl. 17.

Αὐτοκράτορα Κλίου[α]ρ[α]

Λ. Σεπτιμίου Σ[εου-]

ηρον εὐσεβη Π[ε]ρτιν[α]-

- κα Σεβ(δοτον) Ἀρδβ(ικον) Ἀδ[ιδβηνι]-
5. κόν Πδρθικόν μ[εγισ-]
τον ἡ Βρου]η[νων]
leaf. πολις leaf.
10. την ἀνδοτδσιν ποι-
ησδμένων τῶν πε-
ρι Ἀπελλιν β' του Λουκίου
vac ἀρχόντων καὶ Σκε-
πιωνος β' καὶ πωλιωνος
καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου Πδ-
πιου vac

The inscription originally ended at ἀρχόντων in line 11, the names of the other archons being added in a different hand.

Date A.D. 198-208

Published with slight differences, BCH vi, 1882, p. 514, no. 1; JHS viii, 1887, p. 480; CB ii, no. 634; IGR iv, no. 681.

98. EKINOVA, in a lane. Fragment of limestone column, perhaps a milestone, apparently complete above. H. 35 plus, w. 33 plus, th. 30 plus, lett. (line 1) 9. Pl. 16.

✓VIII✓

vac

✓XV✓

99. MENTES, in a yard (with no. 116), said to be from the site of Stektorion. Arched marble slab, probably from a ciborium; broken right, upper moulding defaced. H. 37 plus, w. 71 plus, th. 9 plus, lett. 2.0 - 2.7. Pl. 16.

at crown of arch.

cross ἐτ[ε]ι ... ἐγένετο]
 τούτ[ο] το ἔργον ἐπ[ὶ]
 ἐπισκ[ο]πού Θεοπροπίου?]

monogram on circular medallion in the spandrel.

Θεοπροπίου (or Θερεπτού)

For the form of the stone, compare no. 123.

100. KARA SANDIKLI, in a stable; said to have been found recently near the mosque. White marble moulding, perhaps the coping of a screen. The inscription is on the upper surface and may represent a re-use of the stone. Broken right. H. 18,5, w. 93 plus, th. 11.5, lett. 1.7 - 3,0. Pl. 17.

cross Κ(ύρι)ε βοήθη τοὺς καλὸς κἀμοντα(s) το ἔρ-
 γον του τημέου Προδρόμου cross

The inscription refers to the building of a church of St. John the Baptist or of some part of it (cf. nos. 90, 91).

101. KARA SANDIKLI, in a house opposite the hamam. Doorstone of Dokimian purple-veined marble. H. 53, w. 26, th. 7.5 - 9.0, lett. 1.2 - 3.0. In the left panel of the door, female bust, spindle and distaff; in the right panel, mirror and comb. Pl. 18.

Αὐρηλίοι Γάιος Λευκι-
 ου καὶ Μάρκιος Ζωτικου
 ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Βρουζηνοι

- - - see note - - - -

5. - - - - - ἐαυτοῖς καὶ

τοῖς γλυκυτάτοις τέκνοις

Αὐρηλῖος Ζωτικῶ καὶ

- Ἀπφιδνω leaf
 εἰ τις δε προσοισι
 10. χειρα την
 βαρυ-
 φθονον
 δισσοις δωροισ
 περιπεσοιτο
 15. συεσφο-
 ραῖς

11. 4-5. Probably an unsuccessful attempt at ἰόντες φρονούντες
 ἐθηκάμεν (sic) ἥρων.

11. 9 ff., cf. JRS xv, 1925, p. 155, no. 141, Epigrammata ex
lap.nos. 376 a.

11. 15f. for συμφοραῖς.

102. ODA KÖYÜ, in the wall of the mosque, by the door. Block of
 greyish-white marble, buried below, broken right. H. 84 plus,
 w. 23 plus, th. 55, lett. (1.1)8, (1.2) 3, (ll. 3-10) 3.5 - 4.0.
 On the left side of the block, Byzantine interlacing decoration.
 Pl. 18 .

Ψ vac?

- Αγα[θη Τυχη]
 Ααρ. Ν[εικη ἐ-
 τειρη[θεν]
 5. Ααρ. Π[ροκλον]
 ανδρ[α Βου]
 λευτη[ν τον γλυ]
 κυτατ[ον νεον]

ἡρώα [Ἰησαντά]

10. ἔτη [λδ']

Restoration exempli gratia

1.1 The purpose of the ψ is uncertain.

The monument does not appear to be an epitaph in the usual sense of the word, but is more likely to have been the base of a statue of the deceased, erected in a public place.

103. KARA SANDIKLI, outside the mosque, with no. 97. Grey-white marble bomos with omphaloid top. H. 118, w. 38, 33-34, 40, th. 33 33-35, 42, lett. 1.2 - 1.8. On left side, in panel, stilus=case; on right, in panel, scroll. Pl. 18.

σημὶα τοσ' ἐΐθευξεν Εὐτροπίω
κυρίλλῃ συνευνοῦς
ὡς σοφίης μέτρον ἔσχε μέ-
γα τειμεῖς τε ἀριστοῦς

5. ὃν τειμήσε συνκλητικῶν
ναε γένος δὶα πίστιν
πολλὰ τε μοχθήσαντα ὁ-
δοιπορίαις καρδίαις τε
ἐλθῶν δ' ἰς πατρίδα ἀνε-

10. πλυσσάτο βιοτοιο τελευτήν
εἶχε γὰρ καὶ θεὸν ἐπήκοον
ὃν πεποθήκει leaf.
εἰ δέ τις τῷ τυνβῷ του-
τῷ κακοεργεῖ χεῖρα

15. προσοίσει
ὀρφανὰ λειψεῖ τέκνα

- καὶ οἶκον ἔρημον
 Κυρίλλαν τ' ἀλοχον μονήν
 ἐνθα τεθνήδει
 20. εἰ δ' ἕτερον τις τινὰ
 θήσει δώσει τὰ μείων
 χρυσούς ἑκάτον.

104. ODA KÖYÜ, in a field 300 m. SW of the village. Grey-white crystalline marble column, broken below and behind, buried above. H. 95 plus, diam. 35, lett. 1.9 - 2.2. Pl. 17.

- Ἀτταλικοῦ [Ἀ]τταλῶ
 καὶ Ἀρμίδ τοῖς γο-
 νέουσι καὶ Ἀουιδίῳ καὶ
 Ἀκυλῶ τοῖς ἀδελ-
 5. φοῖς καὶ Ἀτταλῶ ἀνε-
 ψίω εὐσεβείας τε καὶ
 μνήμης χάριν τον κιο-
 νὰ συν τῷ ὠρολογίῳ
 καὶ το μνημεῖον

1.8 Compare the sundial from Mykonos, inscribed Ζήνωνι ἥρωι,
 which also appears to have formed part of a sepulchral monument,
 P. Le Bas (ed. by S. Reinach), Voyage Archéologique en Grèce et
 en Asie Mineure, Paris 1888, p. 110, pl. 121.

105. OTLUK, in a wall between the upper and lower villages.
 White marble doorstone with arched pediment, said to be from
 Yanik Ören. The upper part of the door defaced by a circular

hole. H. 131, w. 63, th. 22-27, lett 1.2 - 1.6. In the door panels; top left, spindle and distaff; top right and bottom left, paterae or bosses; bottom right, key-plate (?). Pl. 18.

In the pediment, man leading horse.

Ἀσιννίος [καὶ πλ]αυτός [καὶ Ἀχι]λλεύς γ' καὶ Χρηστοῦ ἡ
 αὐτῶν τέκοντα
 τῷ ἰσὶω ἀνδρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ φιλοδικοπῶτα ἐπεὶ ἡδεως μετὰ αὐτοῦ
 ἐῖσε [- - - - -] ΑΙΛΑΣ
 [-]ΥΣ ΠΡΟ [- - - - -] ΤΩ [- - - - -]

1.1 Though the letters are badly worn, it is certain that none of them is in the dative. If the restoration is correct, the deceased was Achilles son of Achilleus.

1.2 ἀνδρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ cf. Cyzicus p. 285^{no. 255}. φιλοδικοπῶτα would normally be applied to a slave or freedman (MAMA iv, no. 336).

106. KOCHISAR, outside the mosque. Limestone bomos, broken above. H. 50 plus, w. -, 35, 45, th. -, 34, 43, lett. 1.2 - 3.7. Pl. 18.

[- - - - -] ὧν]

τες ἀπὸ [ρ]

τίσμεν το

μνημῖον συν

5. τῷ Βωμῷ μνή-

μης χάριν

ἐτ(ε)ι τκ' μνη(νι) βί'

(ε)ῖ δε τεις μετὰ τὸν ἡμε-

τερον θάνατον ἀλλαν

10. βάλῃ δὴ (ναί) τῷ τὰμ(εῖω)

* α, καὶ τῇ πδ-

τρι(εῖ) * ψν. (sic)

Date A.D. 236.

107. MENTES, in a lane. Limestone bomos, broken in two. (a), h. 45 plus, w. 63, 50, -, th. 43, 35, -, (b), h. 92 plus, w. -, 50, 56, th. -, 34, 46, lett. 4 - 5.5. Pl. 18.

- a. Σηστυλλιδ
[vo]ς'Επικ[τητ-]
[ου τῇ δεινι]
- b. γυναικι [γλυκυ]
5. τατη μνη [μης]
Χάριν καὶ ἑα[ν]
τῷ ζῶν. ἐνορκ[ι]-
ζομενο πο[ν] (sic)
θεον μη τις σ[κ-]
10. [υ]λήσει [τυ]ν βον
σωματος ἡμ-
[ε]τε[ρ]ον

11. 7-8 Lapicide's error for ἐνορκι/ζομένοι τόν.

Published (b only) CB ii, no. 661, with comment on 11. 7 ff.

108. ELLI MESCIT, in a lane. Upper part of limestone bomos, broken below, upper moulding defaced. H. 55 plus, w. -, 35, -, th. -, 37, -, lett. 2-5. Pl. 41

- ναε ἀδελφῶ ναε
Αὐρ. Προκλο[s]
Αὐρ. Ἀπφιδανῶ
ἀνεστήσεν
5. τον β[ωμον] μν-
[ήμης] Χάριν]

109. KOCHISAR, in a cemetery W of the village (Kochisar minaret bore 121 degrees). Limestone bomos, broken below. H. 98 plus,

w. 55, 47, -, th. 50, 41, -, Lett. 3- 4.5. Pl. 19.

Αὐρ. Ἀνδραγα-

θος ἰων ἐδν-

τῶ κ τῶ εῶ @α-

λλω κ τῇ γυνδ-

5. [ι]κι Τ[ατιδ?] τὸ κυμη

[τ]ηριον κατεσκε

[υ]δσεν μνήμης

vac Χάριν vac

(ε)ῖ δε τις ἐπιτη

10. δευσι θησι εἰς τὸ

τάμιον * [βφ?]

11. 3-4 ὁλλω is certain.

Published (11. 1-8) BCH 1893, p. 276, no. 75; complete but with slight differences CB ii, no. 659.

110. EMIRHISAR, in the porch of a house at E end of the village.

White marble doorstone, said to have been dug up at W end of village, broken below. H. 55 plus, w. 65, th. 24-17, lett.

1.1 - 1.5. The door panels were never finished. Pl. 19.

[έτο]υς τμή. Αὐρ Ἀλεξανδρος Γα[ι]ου Εὐκλριπε[υς]

[βο]υλευτης καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Λυρηλιδ Ζωτικη

Ἀλμᾶ κατεσκεύασαν τὸ μνημεῖον ἰωντες ἐδν-

τοῖς καὶ τοῖς τέκνοῖς αὐτῶν. εἰ τις δε ἡ ἐκ τῆς

5. συγγενείας ἡ ἕτερον θαψεί ἡ κακῶς ποιήσει τῶ

μνημείῳ τούτῳ ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. εἰρη[νῇ]

vac τοῖς παρὰ vac δεῖται vac

1.1 The date is probably $\tau\mu'$, possibly $\tau\nu'$. On Eukarpia see pp. 77f.

11. 6-7. for εἰρηνὴ τοῖς ὑποδοστέοις

cf. CB ii, no. 656, (= IGR iv, no. 694)

Date A.D. 255/6 (or 265/6?)

111. BASKUYUCAK, in a fountain. Double column of veined grey Dokimian marble, cut off above. H. 97 plus, w. 37, th. th. c. 26, lett. 2.2 - 3.0. Pl. 19.

cross

Κλ. Ἀσίδ
 Κλ. Φιλήτω
 Κλ. Φιλοκα-
 λω καὶ Ἀν.
 5. Ἀσίδ μνή-
 μης χάριν
 [ε]ὶς δε τῆς
 ἑτέρου
 θήσει ἐσ-
 10. τὰ δὲ τῷ
 πρὸς τὸν
 Θεόν.

112. GÜREK KÖYÜ, in the steps of a house. Rough limestone slab, said to have been brought from Yanik Üren. H. 95, w. 85,

th. 6 - 10, lett. 2 - 8. Pl. 19.

cross ἐκνυ(ν)θν δ δουλος
 του Θ(εο)ῦ λεον ἐπισκοπο(ς) ἐν ἑτ(ε)λ
 γ(ε)ν(εσεος) ζφξέ μ(η)νι φε(β)ρουα-
 ριον θ' ἰνδ(ικτιωνος) βί

The θ in line 1 and ἐπισκοπο(ς) in line 2 were afterthoughts.

Date A.D. 1056/7 (according to the creation date) or 1058/9
 (according to the indiction).

113. KOZVAN KUYUCAK, in use as a trough by a well. Sarcophagus-
 lid of grey-veined white marble, broken above. H. c.70 plus,
 w. 227, th. 110 (internal h. 27, w. 200, th. 84). Pl. P5.

The lid takes the form of a flat couch (h. 17), schematically
 represented, the lower edges decorated with dentils and
 cymation. The back and sides of the couch are raised a further
 17 cm., and carry a continuous frieze of hunting scenes in high
 relief. In front the edge of a mattress, with three bands of
 embroidery, is visible; it was originally masked by further
 decoration, consisting of putti in very high relief, now largely
 broken off; sufficient remains to show that the arrangement of
 these putti was almost exactly the same as on the lid of the
 Sidamaria sarcophagus in Istanbul (see below), except at the
 left hand end, where the positions of the larger terminal putto
 and of the edge appear to have been reversed, as on the sarco-
 phagus of Claudia Antonia Sabina (below). Two figures of
 indeterminate sex, which have lost their heads and are partly
 buried, recline on the mattress; that on the left holds a fold
 of its cloak in its left hand, and a now defaced object in its

right; both hands rest on the edge of the mattress. The figure on the right holds a scroll (?), which is broken off flush with the edge of the mattress.

The lid belonged to a sarcophagus of the "Asiatic" type (C.R. Morey, Sardis v, pt.i, passim; M.Lawrence, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, xx, 1951, pp. 199 ff.). Within the type, of which several dozen examples are known, its closest connexion is with the Sidamaria sarcophagus, the only one that has a continuous frieze of hunting scenes around the back and sides of the lid (Morey, op.cit. pp. 40 ff.; the lid is illustrated by Mendel, Catalogue.....Constantinople i, no. 112, and by Th. Reinach, Mon. Piot x, 1903, p.92). The lid at Sagalassos (Morey, op. cit. pp. 53 f.; Pamphylien u. Pisidien ii, p. 144, fig. 113) is also fairly close in the arrangement of its putti, but appears to lack the hunting scenes. Both the Sidamaria and Sagalassos lids are assigned by Morey to the "Sidamara Technique", whereas that of Claudia Antonia Sabina (Morey op. cit. pp. 6 ff.) is assigned to the "Lydian Technique".

The distribution of sarcophagi of the Sidamara technique in central Asia Minor is so wide that it is inconceivable that they should all have been produced at a single centre. The theory of a travelling team of sculptors using local materials (J. Shapley, Art Bulletin v, 1923, pp. 62 ff.; Morey, op. cit. p. 78) has much to commend it, though the centre from which this team drew its recruits is still uncertain. Dokimian is the most likely centre; it was, as an examination of its quarries shows, the principal source of good quality statuary marble on the Anatolian Plateau, and a number of signatures of Dokimian

sculptors known (below, no.) from all parts of the Plateau show that they travelled widely.

Unfortunately the type of marble used in the Kuyucak lid is uncertain. It did not appear to be Dokimian, and may well be local. Quarries of greyish-white marble are said to exist in Burgas Dagi, between the Pentapolis and Sebaste. The Sagalassos lid is presumably of local stone, while a second one of two from Hadrianoi in Pisidia (AS ix, 1959, pp. 108 f, pls. xix-xx) appears to be a lid of the same type in an early stage of roughing out. This would point to the use in some cases at least of local materials, though it remains probable that a factory on the coast, perhaps at Ephesos or Prokonnesos, manufactured sarcophagi for the export market.

Date first half of 3rd century A.D.

114. SALTİK, in a yard. Doorstone of white Dokimian marble. H. 85 plus, w. 67, th. 27. In the panels 1) female bust, 2) male bust, 3) comb and mirror, 4) stilus-case. The lateral pilasters are decorated with vine-scrolls. Uninscribed. Pl. P4 .

115. ODA KÖYÜ, in the mosque. White marble hexagonal pillar with capital cut from a single block. Cut off below. H. 66 plus, w. 23, 22, th. 23, 12. Capital has defaced cross on front, rosettes on sides, back plain. Uninscribed. Pl. P5 .

116. MENTES, in a yard. Said to be from the site of Stektorion. Uninscribed marble slab, broken above and left. H. 104, w. 57, th. 7. Decorated with moulded panels and a peacock in relief; originally served as the banister of an ambo-stair (cf. Mon. Piot x, 1903, p. 136, fig. 17: Catalogue...Constantinople ii, nos. 645-647, MAMA v, nos. 58, 96, 145. Pl. P5 .

PHRYGIA SALUTARIS

Prymnessos

Prymnessos lay just to the E of the modern village of Süglün, on and about a very high mound which must be largely natural. At the top, on the E side, is a large depression corresponding to the cavea of the theatre (MAMA iv, p. x, pl. 1). At the foot, on the W side, are remains of an indeterminate building, heavily constructed, while further to the SW (S of Süglün) the mosque Cuma Cami'i stands on a low mound formed by the debris of another. A large apse built of stone blocks and oriented SE, with a pinkish cement floor, was being robbed out in 1955 immediately S of the S corner of the mosque. It may have belonged to a church, or possibly to a gymnasium or other public building.

The sarcophagus of a tabularius regionaris Ipsinae et Moeteanae (no. 118) brings up once again the question of the location of Ipsos. Prymnessos is 41 km. from Çay, Ramsay's site for Ipsos (reaffirmed in Social Basis, pp. 296 ff.), but only 18 km. from Sipsin, the alternative suggested by Honigsmann (Byzantion x, 1935, pp. 647 ff.) and supported with characteristic vigour by Robert (Hellenica vii, 1949, pp. 217 ff.). As they point out, Ramsay's identification of the Hellenistic and Byzantine Ipsos with the Roman Julia rests on quite insufficient evidence. This inscription, by showing the separate existence of an Ipsos, or at least a regio Ipsina, at a time when Julia was flourishing under its own name (HN(2), pp. 677 f.) finally disposes of it.

For what it is worth, the Turkish 1;200,000 map marks what appears to be a very large mound at Sipsin; the resemblance of name is striking, but the site requires examination on the ground. Needless to say, the position of Julia, at or near the modern Çay, which is well attested by the Peutinger Table, is not affected by the removal of Ipsus (p. 170).

Moetea, which might supply a further clue to the position of Ipsos, is unknown.

Prymnessos
Inscriptions.

117. SÜĞLÜN, in the doorway of a house. Fragment of white marble architrave, buried above, broken left, right and behind. H. 26 plus, w. 56 plus, th. 38 plus, lett. 6. Pl. 19 .

?A] V T W [V E I V W ?

Possibly part of the inscription of which a fragment, "on a cornice", was seen by Hamilton; Researches, ii, no. 174, CIG iii, 3882 h.

118. SÜĞLÜN, in a fountain (Güvercinlik Çesmesi). Pink trachyte sarcophagus, with tabula ansata, buried below. H. 57 plus, w. 207 th. 83, lett. 3-4. Pl. 19 .

d(is) m(anibus)

M. Aur. Victorinus leaf

Augustorum libertus

tabularius regionari(u)s

5. Ipsina(e) et Moeteanae

Mauricius li(bertus) patrono v(otum)

fecit aream tantum

Τ. ΣΤΑΘΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΕΡ' ΕΥΕΧΟΡΗΣΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΡΩΝ ΕΠΙΤΕΘΗΝΔΙ ΜΥΗΜΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ

The stone was covered with moss and dripping with water. There was no possibility of making an impression, and I noticed and cleaned lines 6-8 only after sunset, too late to photograph

them. Part of line 6 appears on the photograph from which the drawing was made; ll. 7-8 are on the body of the sarcophagus, below the tabula.

1.4 cf. the tabularius at Eulandra a little further to the East; ABSA iv, 1897-8, p. 50.

1.5 On Ipsos and Moetea (?), see above, pp. ¹⁰⁴f. *Μοιτῶς* is known as a personal name CB i, no. 78.

PHRYGIA SALUTARIS

Ayaz Ini

The ancient name of the settlement at Ayaz Ini is uncertain. A short and not altogether accurate account of the church is given by Strzygowski⁽¹⁾, while an inscription and a photograph of the exterior are published in MAMA i, p. 202.

The church is cut in a cliff of whitish volcanic tufa on the W side of the valley about 500 m. S of the village. A number of cells and arcosolia cut in the rock nearby suggest that, like most of the Cappadocian rock-churches, it belonged to a monastery. Since at least one of the tombs further up the valley is certainly pre-Byzantine, it is probable that there was also an ancient village on or near the site of the present one, and the church may well have accommodated the local population as well as the monks.

As the cliff faces E, the narthex lies on the inner side of the church (pl. 21), and is reached by a rock-cut corridor running the entire length of the S side of the church (Pl. P6, B).

The church proper is of cross-in square plan (pls. 21; P6, A, C, D). The dome stands on a low drum, with a single window on the E. The four arms of the cross are barrel-vaulted, while the spaces in the angles have domical vaults (see below). The dome and main barrel-vaults were supported on four piers, while two more piers, separated from the W wall only by narrow arched slits, carried barrel-vaults spanning N-S at a slightly lower level than the main vaults. All ^{six} piers have been completely destroyed.

Most of the vaults are slightly stilted.

The main apse has three narrow windows, flanked by double niches, while that on the N is lit by a single small window. These four windows, with the one in the dome-drum, can never have lit the church effectively. The south lateral apse has fallen. The position of the iconostasis is shown by two broken projections on the N and S walls, just to the W of the line of the E dome-piers.

The narthex and corridor are decorated with wide arched niches some of which have mouldings; a cross and an inscription in relief(MAMA loc. cit.) fill two of the spandrels of the corridor-niches. The door-jambs and lintels are carefully cut, with imitation mitred joints. The tympanum of the door between the church and the narthex was perforated with holes 15-20 cm. square. The mouldings are all well cut, but vary considerably among themselves.

There is no sign that the interior of the church was ever plastered. The careful treatment of the mouldings and vaults, and the presence of the cross and inscription in relief, suggest that it was not; nor are there any traces of painting on the unplastered rock, such as is found in some of the Cappadocian rock-churches.

The exterior of the east end of the church, including part of ^{K₂} dome-drum, is cut in imitation of a built church.
^

Internal evidence of date is confined to the absence, apparently intentional, of painted plaster. This may be due to reasons of economy or local fashion, or more probably to iconoclasm. A date in the late eighth or early ninth century

seems probable.

The plan is of interest as showing its derivation from a type with a full two-bay nave as opposed to the single bay usual in cross-in-square churches. The two westernmost piers were so close to the W wall that their replacement by engaged pilasters would shorten the church by less than a metre, showing them to be survivals from an earlier six-piered prototype, rather than additions, for the sake of extra space, to a four-piered plan⁽²⁾.

One at least of the vaults over the corner-spaces is in fact not so much^a domical vault as a dome resting on four rudimentary pendentives (pl. P6, A); similar domes over corner-spaces occur in some of the Cappadocian rock-churches (e.g. Églises Rupestres, pl. 95). The use of domical vaults as such is very rare on the Plateau, though common in the area of Constantinople.

Ballık. About 2 km. up the valley from Ayaz İni, at a place known as Ballık, is a small rock-cut chapel in a poor state of preservation (pl. 22). The nave, measuring only about 4 x 3 m., is roofed with a somewhat flattened barrel vault, and has its N and S walls divided into four flat niches divided by pilasters. There are meagre traces of figure-paintings, probably of single standing saints, in the niches on the N side.

The nave was divided from the apse by a rock-cut screen with two arched openings on either side of a central arched door, and a small, roughly semicircular, lunette above.

At the centre of the apse is an opening leading to a further small chamber, while at either side are remains of rock-cut seats.

NOTES

(1) Kleinasien, pp. 145 f., from F. von Reber's account (Abh. der III Cl. d. Kais. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., XXI, 1898).

(2) St. Philon at Rhizokarpasia in Cyprus (Γ. Α. Σωτηρίου, *Τὰ Βυζαντινὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Κύπρου*, i, Athens 1935, fig. 6, pls. 10b, 14) appears, from the plan and photographs of the surviving parts, to have had exactly the same arrangement of piers as Ayaz Ini.

The cross-in-square with a full extra bay added to the nave, from which this plan seems to be derived, is not a usual Byzantine one, though there are several examples in Georgia, of which the cathedral at Kutais (Armenier i, p. ? , fig. 195), completed in 1003, is the best known. The Pantobasilissa at Triglia on the Sea of Marmara (ABSA xiii, 1906-7, pp. 291 ff.) was apparently of this plan, but the W end has been lengthened. It is obviously rather late. In Constantinople, one of a group of churches excavated on the site of the new University buildings (N. Firatli, in Cahiers Archéologiques v, 1951, pp. 163 ff., *église C*) may be another example, though the dome-piers are linked by E-W walls and there is no indication in either the text of the article or the published plan, that these walls are not original. The excavator dates it to the sixth century.

PHRYGIA SALUTARIS

Synnada

A visit to the Synnada area in 1955 added little to what was already known of it. Most of the inscriptions given in MAMA iv, and vi have now either disappeared or been removed to the museum at Afyon, and very few new ones have been dug up.

The city was one of the most prosperous in Phrygia, being the meeting-place of a conventus that included, according to Pliny (NH v, 105) places as far apart as Julia, Dorylaion and Akmonia. It gave its name to the marble quarried at Dokimion 40 km. to the NNE, which was exported to all parts of the Roman Empire. The exact function of Synnada in the marble trade is still unexplained.

The site of the city was centred on a mound a little to the W of the modern town of Şuhut. On the E edge of the mound, which has a flat top rather over 100 m. in diameter, there is a semicircular depression, now used as a cattle-market, that represents the ancient theatre. The bridge over the Çakırözü Deresi (Kumalar Su according to MAMA iv, p.x), just to the N of the mound, has four arches and is probably of Roman origin; many of the voussoirs have mason's marks in Greek. The upper parts are, however, Turkish.

There is no sign of other ancient buildings; the base of the minaret of the principal mosque (no. 128) gives a good idea of the richness of some of those that have been lost.

Other sites in the Synnadic plain include the following.

1) At Ağın, settlement site with numerous rock-cut chambers on a low spur NNE of the village.

2) Bedeş; remains of a church are said to have been robbed out about 100 m. SW of the Türbe. There are plenty of Byzantine stones in the Türbe itself (nos. 130, 131; MAMA iv, no. 107). Ramsay (CB ii, p. 753) regarded Bedeş as a suitable site for a city and placed Sibidounda, now identified with certainty in Pisidia (AS x, 1960, pp. 68 f.), there or at Balçıkhisar.

3) Alayunt (Anayurt); some Roman pottery on the outskirts of the village; numerous Byzantine stones including nos. 122, 133, 134 and MAMA iv, nos. 98-102.

4) Atlıhisar does not appear to be an ancient site. The ancient stones there are said to be from Karakurtlar, some way to the west, though Anderson, who placed Sibidounda (above) in the neighbourhood of Atlıhisar, seems to have found some traces of a site there (JHS xviii, 1898, pp. 104 ff).

5) Half way between Seydi Sultan and Hallaç, by a spring at the SE corner of an isolated hill, there are signs of ancient habitation, with Roman pottery and recent robber-trenches on a regular plan. On the hill, a number of tombs (pl. 20) and two larger rectangular chambers (cisterns?) have been cut in the soft volcanic tufa. This may be the site identified by Ramsay (Social Basis, pp. 268, 292) as "officina marmorum", apparently the depot for blocks from the Dokimian quarries awaiting transport to the coast as well as the main agency controlling the working of the quarries. The exact function of Synnada in the marble trade has yet to be fully explained. Ramsay

(Mélanges AH ii, 1882, pp. 290 ff.) attempted to interpret the quarry-marks inscribed on the rough blocks, and much later (Social Basis, pp. 266 ff.) collected the evidence for the presence of imperial procurators at Synnada, but there is too little indisputable fact on which to reconstruct the administrative system of the quarries. One strong objection to the theory that the blocks passed through an officina at Synnada before being dispatched to the coast is that of about 77 marked blocks of Dokimian or similar marble known, not one is from the area of Synnada; this although Synnada has been very thoroughly worked over from the epigraphic point of view⁽¹⁾.

NOTES

1) 32 have been recorded at Dokimion, 12 at Afyon, 8 in the area of Altıntaş (upper Tembris Valley), where there are other quarries of the same type of marble, 1 at Seidler (N of Dokimion), 3 at Akşehir, 1 at Nuri Bey near Prymnessos, 1 at Izmir (from Ephesos), 1 at Istanbul, 9 in Rome, 5 at Leptis (Tripolitania) and 3, of dubious provenience, in Paris. The exact numbers are somewhat dubious, as it is sometimes impossible to decide which stones have been published twice over from independent and differing copies.

References to these quarry marks have been collected in ESAR iv, p. 653; see also CIL iii, nos. 12231-12235; JRS ii, 1912, p. 252, no. 6; JRS xviii, 1928, p. 22, nos. 232-233; IRT nos. 794 a-e. There are also 3 unpublished examples at Kürt Köyü, two at Afyon, one at Dokimion, one in Constantinople and one at Izmir.

Synnada
Inscriptions

119. HALLAÇ, in a pile of stones on the SE of the village. White marble fragment, H. 46 plus, w. 27 plus, th. 31 plus, lett.

3-3.2. Pl. .

[? tota
[? provin]ciae
[urb
[aris]

120. ŞUHUT, in a fountain (Baş Çeşme). Marble or limestone stele, broken above, buried left and behind. H. 56 plus, w. 30 plus, th. 20 plus, lett. 3. Below the inscription, two defaced rosettes. Pl. 20.

? γυναικὶ κορυπίδιδ μνηστῆς
Χάρις

121. ŞUHUT, in a fountain near the mound. Marble block, moulded above, buried below, left and right. H. 43 plus, w. 148 plus, th. -, lett. 5-8. Pl. 20.

Αὐτῶν Σελυκτοῦ καὶ Περσῶν[vos ---

122. ANAYURT (Alayund), in the wall of a yard near the cemetery. Fragment of white marble moulding, broken left and right. H. 13, w. 34 plus, th. -, lett. 1.7 - 2.6. At the right of the inscription, incised cantharus with vine growing from it. Pl. 20.

[cross ἐγ]ένετο το ἔργον
 [τουτ]ο ἐπὶ Ἐνγενῇ τοῦ
 [διδ]κo(νου) κε ὑκονομου

123. BEDES, in a house, white marble slab, forming part of a small arch, probably from a ciborium. The outer edges are moulded and decorated with an incised vine-pattern. The curved edge, also moulded, bears an inscription, while an eagle with raised wings is incised in the spandrel. On the back, incised Latin cross and simple incised border. Broken below and left. H. 54 plus, w. 67 plus, th. 9, lett. 3.5 - 4.0. Pl.20.

ἡ περ ἀφ' ἑσθης ἀμάρτυρων τοῦ θείου...

Compare the incised peacock of MAMA iv, no. 106, from the same area.

124. BEDES, in a house. White marble fragment of a string-moulding, broken left and right. H. 9, w. 13 plus, th. 21, lett. 3. Pl.20.

ὑπερ ἀνδρῶν ἀντρε[ws] ----
 ----] Αλεξάνδρου

125. ŞUHUT, in the yard of a mill (with no. 126). Male figure in white marble, nude except for a cloak fastened on the right shoulder and falling down the left side. The left hand supports a fold of the cloak, full of fruit. The head and right arm are missing and both legs are broken off above the knees. H. 40 plus, w. 25, th. 19. Uninscribed. Pl.20.

Probably a figure of Autumn, from a group of the four seasons, cf. that on the arch of Trajan at Benevento; G.M.A. Hanfmann, The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, II) vol.i, pp. 216,f. ; ii, p. 162, no.307, fig.123.

126. ⁵SUHUT, in the same yard as no. 125. White marble female figure, fully draped, seated on a cylindrical moulded base or short column. The body is broken off at the waist. H. 53 plus, w. 47, th. 30, uninscribed. The left side was left rough, as if the figure had been intended to stand against a wall, or, more probably, had formed part of the decoration of a sarcophagus. At a later date a barbarous representation of a lion was carved on the back of the body. Pl. 20.

Figures of this general type occur on "Asiatic" sarcophagi; cf. C.R. Morey, Sardis, V, i, figs. 13, 109; M. Lawrence, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, xx, 1951, p. 163 et al. The scale of the present figure suits a sarcophagus, but the column used as a seat is not known on the sarcophagi, where a folding stool is normal.

In both this figure and no. 125, the workmanship is most competent, as was to be expected near so important a centre of the marble-working industry as Dokimion.

127. ⁵SUHUT, in a cemetery. Lintel cut from a column of greyish-white Dokimian marble, with designs in relief on the front and underside; broken right, buried left. H. 30, w. 70 plus, th. 28, uninscribed. Pl. 25.

For a close parallel, cf. MAMA iv, no. 95, dated 1063/4.

128. ŞUHUT, in the base of the minaret of Ulu Cami. Several decorated stones including a string moulding with key pattern, a section of Roman coffered ceiling and pieces of Byzantine lintels. Pl. P5.

129. ŞUHUT, in a house. Marble pier-capital or impost-block, plain on the long sides, with a Latin cross on each short side. H. 30, w. 49, 37, th. 69, 40, uninscribed. Pl. 20.

130. BEDEŞ, in the wall of the Türbe. White marble lintel with Byzantine decoration, broken right. H. 32, w. 70 plus, th. -, uninscribed. Pl. P6.

131. BEDEŞ, in the wall of the Türbe. White marble slab with Byzantine decoration, from an ambo or screen. H. 84, w. 97, th. 19, uninscribed. Pl. P6.

The Türbe contains numerous other pieces of Byzantine decorative work, and it seems likely that much of this material was brought from a church, said to have been completely destroyed, on the rising ground between the Türbe and the village of Bedeş.

132. AĞIN, beside the mosque. White marble capital, partly carved with acanthus in very low relief, with a plain roundel, as if for a monogram, on each side. H. 50, w. 53, th. 53, uninscribed. Pl. 22.

133. ANAYURT (Alayund), in the wall of the Türbe. White marble lintel with Byzantine decoration in relief. Broken left and right. H. 31, w. 163 plus, th. -, uninscribed. Pl. P6.

134. ANAYURT, in the wall of the Türbe. Greyish-white marble lintel, with Byzantine decoration in relief, broken left and right, H. 28, w. 143 plus, th. -, uninscribed. Pl. P6.

135. ATLIHISAR, in a house. Fine limestone slab, from a screen, with Byzantine guilloche pattern. In the intermediate spaces, a bird, a rosette and a plant in relief. The lower edge has a flat border. Broken left, right and above. H. 58 plus, w. 37 plus, th. 3 - 4.4, uninscribed. Pl. P6.

PISIDIA

Apameia and Kelainai

The Site. The ancient topography of Apameia has been very thoroughly discussed by several modern writers⁽¹⁾, and there is no point in attempting to go over it again in its entirety.

The account given in CB is altogether convincing except in three points (map, pl. 22).

Orgas; the Orgas joined the Maeander above the latter's junction with the Marsyas, after flowing gently through flat country (Strabo, 577). Pliny and Dio Chrysostom (who calls it Orbas) mention it only in passing. The only possible identification seems to be with the stream that rises at the Menderes Düdeni, within the bend of the Maeander to S of the town, which corresponds perfectly to Strabo's description. Ramsay's identification with the Norgaz Cay is attractive but must be ruled out. Even if this stream ever reached the Maeander in summer, which at present it does not, its gradient (about 1:60 according to CB (map opposite p. 397) or slightly less according to the Turkish map), is too steep for it to have been the quiet stream described by Strabo.

Obrima (ablative) given by Pliny as the fourth river of Apameia, may be due to a mis-reading, in a Greek source, of Therma. Ramsay applies the name, with some reservations, to the Menderes Düdeni, but it is unlikely that this, being one of the principal natural curiosities of the area, should have been entirely unnoticed in any other ancient source.

Pliny's "fontes, Claeon et Gelon ab effectu graecorum nominum dicti" may well be the two springs at the Menderes Düdeni described in CB (ii, pp. 407 f.). Ramsay's Gelon is still recognizable, but has been silenced by the building of a rough dam round it; his Claeon, when I visited it, was not in good voice, possibly owing to some change in the water-level of the pool.

The Acropolis of Kelainai. Given the fact that Kelainai, Apameia and the modern Dinar all occupy approximately the same site, which is evident from all the ancient accounts and from the extant remains, there are three possible sites for the acropolis of Kelainai (pl. P7, C, *view from the Byzantine church*).

1) The conical spur to the E of the modern town, on which stand the remains of a Byzantine church. This site has been generally accepted. Apart from the church, however, there is no sign of its having ever been occupied; its defensibility is also in doubt, as it is dominated by the higher hills to which it is connected on the E.

2) The steep-sided but flat-topped hill, with remains of a Hellenistic or Roman theatre, to the N of Dinar. This is covered by a layer of occupation-debris at least 3 m. deep, with pottery ranging from Phrygian to Roman. The sharp edges of the hill suggest that it was once fortified.

3) A smaller flat-topped ridge with scattered Roman and earlier pottery on the left bank of the Marsyas, at the foot of the hill on which the church stands. This is less steep than 2), and is to some extent commanded by an outcrop of rock above

the springs of the Marsyas.

Of the three hills, 1) is presumably the ἑλίβετον τανύ-
μυκες ὄρος mentioned in the Sibylline Books (i, 262,
quoted CB ii, p. 454), as the mountain on which the Ark came
to rest. The presence of the church is thus explained.

Phrygian Kelainai depended for its importance, which was
considerable, largely on its position as a road-centre and in
particular on its command of the pass over Ak Dağ just above
the town. It is therefore likely that the citadel commanded
the road directly and was spacious enough to accomo^mdate at any
rate a large proportion of the population with their goods.
This does not suggest the hill on which the church stands. A
comparison with Gordium, where the fortified acropolis was simply
the old occupation-mound standing inside the walled town, or
with Amorion (p. 146) where much the same may have been the case,
shows that a Phrygian or Persian acropolis was not necessarily
very high. Indeed the hill on the right bank of the Marsyas is
considerably higher than the mound at Gordion, and quite high
enough to conform with Arrian's description of the citadel of
Kelainai (Anab. i, 29) as ἀκρὰ πάντῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ. The hill is
not indeed sheer, but is considerably steeper than the other
two and difficult of approach on all sides. One possible
objection to this theory is provided by the words of Livy (xxxviii
13), "Maeander ex arce^{summa} Celaenarum ortus, media urbe decurrens",
and by the evidence of Strabo (577-578). Strabo tells us that
the Maeander rose ἀπὸ Κελαινῶν λόφου τινός, on which there
had been a city of the same name, though the population had been
transferred by Antiochus Soter to the later Apameia.

Livy has presumably confused Marsyas and Maeander, and the phrase "ex arce summa" is certainly an exaggerated description of any of the possible citadels or of the source of any of the Apameian rivers.

Strabo's account is in general very accurate, and his statement on this point cannot be disregarded, as it seems to indicate the hill on which the church stands as the site of the city of Kelainai. We should probably understand him to mean that the whole mountain was known as Κελαινῶν λόφος, and that Kelainai was situated somewhere on it. He may indeed not have realised that Kelainai was within a mile or so of the later Apameia. The fact remains that the hill in which the theatre is sunk was densely inhabited in Phrygian times.

It is also possible, though unlikely, that there was a fortified place of refuge higher up the mountain, which has still to be discovered. One might compare Livy's account (xxxviii, 18) of the flight of the Gauls from Gordion to a fastness in the mountains some distance away.

The city of Kelainai should therefore be envisaged as crowded on and around the Theatre Hill, which was fortified by Xerxes and served as the acropolis. The hill on the left bank was probably also inhabited, while the agora of Herodotus (vii, 26) lay around the springs of the Marsyas, on the main road and protected to some extent by the acropolis. Herodotus presumably derived his knowledge of the position of the agora from the same source as his description of the westward march of Xerxes, for the palace that the king built on his return from Greece (Xenophon, Anabasis i, 2, 7) seems to have displaced the

market-place at the springs of the Marsyas.

The Hellenistic city. Of the extent and nature of the city of Apameia, built by Antiochus Soter (280-262) we have no specific information from ancient sources. Livy (xxxviii, 13) tells us only that it was "haud procul veteribus Celaenis", while Strabo (577 ff.), who is very vague over the position of Kelainai, merely makes it clear that the Marsyas rose within the city of Apameia and flowed down to the suburbs, where it joined the Maeander. Indeed, it appears that the refoundation by Soter involved a change of centre rather than a real change of site. Probably one or other of the hills beside the Marsyas was retained as an acropolis and a large new quarter, with all the public buildings and amenities to be expected in a Hellenistic city, ^{was built} at the lower end of the narrow gorge of the Marsyas and along the slopes of the hills on either side, facing out across the Maeander.

Hellenistic and Roman Buildings; The greatest concentration of architectural fragments is now in the gardens S of the modern town; Arundell (Seven Churches, p. 108) also mentions ancient walls near the source of the Ilıca, at the foot of the Theatre Hill.

The two arches over the springs of the Ilıca (CB ii, p. 403) are still visible, somewhat obscured by a modern parapet, and by the damming of the stream to form a swimming-bath, so that only the crowns of the arches can be seen above the water.* Above the Menderes Düdeni, near Incirli Pınar (Ramsay's Gelon), are a number of small and unpretentious tombs cut in an outcrop of rock, entered by small, roughly circular, holes, and having no arcosolia or other features of interest (Pl. 22).

* Pl. P7, B.

Byzantine Monuments. As is pointed out in CB (ii, pp.445 ff.), Apameia declined in the Byzantine period, as a result of the decline in importance of the main road up the Maeander and Lykos valleys from Ephesus. Very few of the Christian inscriptions there are much later than the time of Constantine (exceptions include CB ii, nos. 397 f.; MAMA vi, nos. 237 f.). The only Byzantine building preserved, if one excludes small rock-cut chapels such as that mentioned in CB (ii, no. 398) is the comparatively large basilica on the conical hill above the source of the Marsyas.

Sketch plans of this church have already been published by Arundell (Discoveries i, pl. 1) and by Weber (Dinair, Célènes, p. 34, reproduced in Kleinasien, fig. 43 and Cabrol-Leclercq s.v. Apamée), but neither is entirely accurate or complete.

The walls are faced with large, well cut blocks of an intractable yellowish or pinkish breccia, well jointed on the exterior. The blocks of the inner and outer faces almost meet in the centre of the wall, and although some rubble was pushed into the interstices, no mortar appears to have been used, as the core was not intended to carry any load.

The plan (pl. 23) is, up to a point, very typical of the Anatolian basilica or barn-church of the period before the Arab wars. The overall width is 25.70 m., the exterior width of nave and aisles 16.20 m. Internally, the nave and aisles form an exact square of 14.20 m., and the span of the nave (6.35 m.) is almost exactly double that of the aisles. The main arcades were carried on very plain rectangular piers. Only three of the pier-bases were visible, but it is fairly certain that there were originally seven bays to each arcade, with an average span

of about 2 m. between centres. The arches, to judge from one preserved spring-stone (pl. 23), were of slightly horseshoe form, reaching their greatest diameter about 20 cm. above the spring.

There is a small door on the S side of the church, near the W end. The apse is stilted in plan, and has a string-course at a low level on the exterior.

The narthex, which communicates with the nave and aisles through three doors, is divided into three sections by small pilasters which must have carried arches spanning E-W. The central and N sections have exterior doors on the W, while in the S section the door is replaced by a small niche on the exterior of the wall. To N and S of the narthex are two chambers, probably stair-case turrets each about 4 m. square, communicating only with the narthex (see below).

Arundell's plan shows a row of columns parallel to the W wall of the narthex and 15 ft. from it, with walls projecting from the facade to meet it. Unfortunately neither the plan nor the description (Discoveries, pp. 175f.) makes it clear whether these columns formed part of an atrium or of a porch of unusual type, and the only trace of the whole structure that is still visible is a single stone projecting westwards from the S end of the facade, which appears to belong to the S flanking wall.

A somewhat curious feature is the thickening of the wall on either side of the central outer door of the narthex. This appears to be original and may have some connection with the outer porch or atrium. According to Weber, this door, like that between the narthex and the nave, had moulded jambs. A piece of lintel lying on the ground nearby shows mouldings similar

to those of the inner door. Weber also suggests that both these doors had arched heads, but of this there is now no evidence.

Decoration. (see pl. 23) Apart from a large cross incised on the S wall of the narthex, and smaller ones on at least some of the arch-springings, the surviving decoration of the church is confined to simple mouldings. The most elaborate are those of the door-jambs and of the string-course round the apse. The piers are absolutely plain except for a slight fillet at top and bottom, and their bases (not to scale on the drawing) are extremely simple. I was unable to find any of the pier-capitals, except that of the responding pilaster at the W end of the N arcade.

Restoration of the upper parts of the church. The walls are nowhere preserved to a height of much over 2 m., and none of the windows is preserved. The roof, to judge from the comparatively small amount of debris in the nave, was probably of wood. There is no evidence either for or against the existence of a clerestory; galleries are suggested by the presence of stair-case towers.

Comment. The plan of the nave and aisles is typical of the larger Central Anatolian basilicas of the period before the Arab wars. Close parallels can be found at Eski Andaval (Kleinas. Denkm. fig. 30) in the church on Elengirif (Erenler?) Dağı, WSW of Konya (Denkmäler, pp. 108 f., fig. 10), and in several of the Kara Dağ basilicas (1001 Churches, passim).

The absence of a south door in the west wall of the narthex is also perhaps an echo of a type common in Kara Dağ, although it takes a less extreme form in that the S section of the narthex is not separated from the central section by a wall, as is usual

there, (1001 Churches, e.g. fig. 24) and the narthex still has a NW door.

The two chambers flanking the narthex are also an unusual feature in Asia Minor. At Dere Ağzi (Kleinas. Denkm. fig. 111), projections N and S of the narthex house stairs leading to the galleries; similar stairs, though leading from the aisles instead of from the narthex, are used in St. Sophia at Constantinople (A.M. Schneider, Die Hagia Sophia zu Konstantinopel Berlin, 1939, fig. 1). Kasr ibn Wardan in Syria (Butler, PUAES 1904-5-9 II, B, i, p. 30) has no narthex, but the stairs are contained in a tower projecting N from the NW corner of the church. There can be little doubt that both at Apameia and in the problematic church no. 32 at Değile (1001 Churches, p. 210, fig. 164) the chambers flanking the narthex were used for this purpose, but that the stairs, being of wood, have been lost.

The galleries implied by these stairs, if such they were, are definitely a feature imported from the Mediterranean coast, where they occur at Antalya (Papers of the British School at Rome xxiii, (1955), p. 100), Dere Ağzi (Kleinas. Denkm. pp. 300 ff) and elsewhere. Discounting Alahan, which belongs, in spite of its distance from the coast, entirely to a coastal tradition, the only certain example on the Plateau is Değile no. 32, which is completely unlike anything else in Lykaonia. It is of course possible that at Apameia the gallery extended only over the narthex, as it does in Çanlı Kilise (1001 Churches, pp. 404 ff.).

The line of columns seen by Arundell to the west of the church may perhaps have belonged to an open columnar porch, such as is used, in place of a closed narthex, in many churches in

Syria and Palestine⁽¹⁾. A modified form with only two columns occurs in Cilicia and even in Kara Dağ, but both in Syria and in Asia Minor the columnar porch acts as a narthex and is not used to supplement a closed narthex when this occurs. A more probable alternative to a columnar porch is the type of atrium found in the lower church at Perge (Kleinas. Denkm., fig. 21), which had L-shaped piers at the corners and, presumably, columns along all four sides. This type of atrium also occurs at Korykos, in the "Grabeskirche extra muros" (MAMA ii, pp. 130 f., fig. 130), and in the "Council Church" at Ephesos (Ephesos IV, i, pp. 41 ff., fig. 21), but it is not a common form in Asia Minor. Normally the atrium had only three colonnades, being bounded on the E by the narthex of the church⁽²⁾, though in some instances, where the narthex itself was fronted with columns, it gave the effect of being a complete peristyle. (e.g. the "Querschiffbasilika extra muros" at Korykos, MAMA ii, p. 113, fig. 109). If the columns at Apameia did in fact belong to an atrium, it must have been a small one, as the ground slopes downwards quite steeply to the west of the church.

In spite of the "coastal" elements in its plan, which are not entirely unexpected in view of the geographical position of Apameia, the church is in other respects a typical example of a Central Anatolian basilica. The rectangular piers and the apparent lack of any decoration based on the acanthus, the stilted apse without lateral chambers, and the straight-forward basilican interior, are all features that could be paralleled in dozens of churches on the Plateau.

Dating. The only inscription recorded in the church is CB ii, no. 397, a simple *ΚΥΡΙΕ ΒΟΗΘΕΙ* dated by Ramsay, from the

form of the letters, as "not likely to be later than the fourth century". But lettering is never a very reliable criterion and is not to be relied on in this case any more than in others.

As there is no church in Central Anatolia that can be dated with certainty to the fourth century, there is a general and not unnatural tendency for the earliest Plateau churches to be ascribed to the fifth. In this case the style of decoration is so simple as to be of little use chronologically, though it is probably permissible to doubt whether rectangular piers, as opposed to reused Roman columns, would have been used at a city such as Apameia until at any rate the later fifth century. The plan of the west end proves only that the builder had seen some of the larger churches on the S coast, most of which also appear to be of the fifth. The massive stone blocks of the walls suggest an earlier rather than a later date, and are very unlikely to be later than the sixth century. In view of the lack of dated parallels near at hand, greater precision than this is impossible⁽³⁾.

NOTES

(1) e.g. at Jerash; Gerasa, plans xxxvii, xxxix, xli; at Umm idj Djimal, PUAES 1904-5-9, figs. 151, 158, 167, 171; at Dâr Kîtâ, AAES 1899-1900, ii, fig. 79.

(2) Indeed, at Perge and Korykos, it is not absolutely certain that the east colonnade of the ^{atrium}~~narthex~~ did not serve as a narthex.

(3) Leclercq, in Cabrol-Leclercq i, 2, cols. 2504 f., goes to great lengths to make the church pre-Constantinian. Strzygowski, Kleinasien, p. 56, does not commit himself to Weber's Constantinian dating.

Apameia
Inscription

My time at Apameia was largely taken up with non-epigraphic work, and in any case the supply of inscriptions has declined considerably of late. In fact I was able to add only one to the existing corpus.

136. DIKICI, in a lane. Limestone block with recessed panel.

H. 94 (panel 55), w. 140 (panel 88), th. 35, lett. 3-4.

Pl. 24, from impression only.

Αὐρ. Δημητριος β' τοῦ Φιλίππου
ἐποίησεν τὸ ἔργον συν τῷ
στάτῳ τῷ πατρὶ μοι καὶ τῇ
μητρί [ρι μοι] τάττω μ[ν]ίσχας χάριν.

PISIDIA

Apollonia and Tymandos

In the Hellenistic and early Roman periods the only city (see below) in the Kara Arslan Ovasi was probably Apollonia, which stood on the slopes below the Turkish town of Uluborlu, facing northwards across the plain. Ramsay argued (HGAM, p.401 n) that the original site of the Hellenistic colony was at Olukman in the plain below, but the large quantity of ancient stones in the field-walls on the slopes, and the reports of ancient building-foundations discovered there are enough to show that Olukman was at best only an outlying suburb of Apollonia.

In the 4th century Apollonia took the name of Sozopolis (MAMA iv, no. 149), and at some time in the early Byzantine period the precipitous rock overhanging the town was fortified (below); it remained an important fortress at least until the Turkish conquest⁽¹⁾.

Turkish Uluborlu was centred originally round the saddle to the W of the castle, while the numerous Greek population was allowed to continue living in the castle itself until 1923, when they were removed to Greece (MAMA iv, p.xiv). Today the town is moving back down the hill towards its original position, and many of the houses of the old Turkish quarter have been abandoned.

The Castle. The castle of Sozopolis, which still dominates the town, is protected on three sides by almost unscalable cliffs some 200 m. high (well shown in MAMA iv, pls. 5-7). On the W,

facing the Turkish town, the slope is less steep, and it is only on this side that any artificial fortifications are to be seen ~~there~~.

The walls are built of reused blocks, with a strong mortar core, and are about 3 m. thick. The size of the blocks varies considerably, and parts of the wall have been rebuilt at various times. A stretch about 180 m. long with two gates and three towers, is preserved to a considerable height (pls. 24; P7, E). The main gate, at the lower (S) end of the preserved section, is a simple square tower with a vaulted passage running through it; a little extra space inside the tower was provided by large arched niches on either side of the passage; the vaults are of mixed brick and stone construction (pl. P7, E), and the upper parts at least of the tower were reinforced with timber, embedded in the core of the walls. There is no indication of how the gates were hung.

The second gate, just to S of the northernmost tower of the wall, has been badly damaged, but seems never to have been more than an arched opening in the wall. It is protected from frontal attack by a sharp slope, as well as by the tower beside it.

The towers are solid, having no internal chambers. At the extreme N end ^a wall about 3 m. thick projects at right angles to the main wall; it does not appear to have formed part of a tower, and its purpose is uncertain, though it may have been used as a bastion to provide cross-fire covering the wall to the S, or possibly to cover a sally-port on the extreme edge of the cliff.

Some foundations just to the S of the second tower may belong either to an outer wall (cf. p. 19, n. 5) or, more probably, to an earlier square tower, later replaced by the present polygonal one. At this point the curtain-wall overlies the end of an earlier wall running towards the E, which can be traced for about 100 m. inside the castle; whether this was originally the S wall of the castle, or an internal division such as is found in some Byzantine and Seljuk citadels, is uncertain⁽²⁾. The extent of the castle down the hill on the S is quite uncertain. There are faint signs of a wall running E from the main gate, but this may have been merely a terrace to support the road, for the outer wall seems to have continued down the hill, which, although very steep, is not precipitous at this point.

The castle as a whole would probably repay further study, especially if some of the more critical points could be excavated. Central Anatolia is rich in Byzantine castles, but only a few, such as Amorion (p. 146), Kotiaion, Sozopolis and, in so far as it is Byzantine, Ankara, show any signs of deliberate planning, as opposed to mere plugging of the gaps in almost impregnable natural defences. It would also be interesting to know whether there are still any "remains of the old Hellenic walls, consisting of very large blocks of stone" that Hamilton (Researches, ii, p. 363) saw incorporated in the Byzantine work.

Tymandos lay about 11 km. ENE of Apollonia near the modern Yaztu or Yassi Viran (WE, p. 383; MAMA iv, p. xiii). The question of its status as a city at various periods is still open to discussion, since it already had a strategos in 140 (MAMA iv, no. 235), although the charter that gave it municipal

status (ibid. no. 236) appears to be of much later date⁽³⁾. Possibly it was reduced to the rank of village at some intermediate time, as Orkistos appears to have been (MAMA vii, no. 305).

It is probably fair to say that Tymandos rather than Apollonia was the natural centre of this plain. The advantages of the latter were its immensely strong acropolis and its control over the road that became, under Augustus, the Via Sebaste from Comama to Lystra. Today Uluborlu, perhaps weakened by the loss of its Greek community, has given up much of its importance and the greater part of its territory to Senirkent, the modern representative of Tymandos.

Other inhabited sites in the plain included:

1) Olukman (WE, p. 352) about 4 km. N of Uluborlu; it was perhaps a suburb of Apollonia situated on the direct line of the Via Sebaste, if, as seems likely from the lie of the ground, it avoided passing through Apollonia.

2) There are said to be ruins at Bozdurmuş, 1 hour NW of Gençali where the Via Sebaste met the shore of Hoyran Gölü.

3) On the S edge of the plain there are the curious rock-cuttings at Alcibar or Altıncebbar (WE p. 403; MAMA iv, p. xiii, pl. 7). The purpose and date of these remains obscure.

Several other place-names in this area are known from inscriptions. Plouristra, probably near the modern Pise (or Başköy) is known from a dedication to Men Plouristreus (MAMA iv, no. 230; but see also RE s.v. Pissa), while the demos of Plinna is commemorated in MAMA iv no. 137, which was first seen by Sterrett (WE no. 597) near Iley (İleydağ) in the pass leading

westwards out of the plain. Arka (MAMA iv, no. 251; WE no. 586) is unidentifiable. The name Banboula (WE no. 564) has been recognised in the modern village Bambul, S of Tatarlı (MAMA iv, p. 73; it is not marked on the 1:200,000 map). Sterrett takes Akena (WE no. 504; cf. WE no. 564) to be a place-name, but the meaning of the text is uncertain.

Apollonia and Tymandos

NOTES

- (1) On the origin of Apollonia, Roman Rule, p. 1315, n. 20; I have not visited Olukam; the presence of numerous inscriptions in the gardens in the plain is to be explained as due to the presence of cemeteries rather than of a city. Ruge, in RE s.v. $\Sigma\omega\zeta\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\varsigma$ 1, writing before the publication of MAMA iv, is unnecessarily sceptical of the identity of Sozopolis with Apollonia.
- (2) The most complete example in Asia Minor of a city-fortress with internal divisions is at Alanya; S.Lloyd and D.S.Rice, Alanya (Occ. Publ. of the B.I.A.A., no. 4), 1958, p. 11, fig.1. Antalya had a similar division into quarters or wards; Pamphylien u. Pisidien, i, p.8, fig.4. Alanya is almost wholly Seljuk and Antalya (and Ankara, which is also planned on this principle) at least partly so. At Trebizond, the castle, which is almost entirely Byzantine, though largely later than 1204, is divided into two parts, of which the upper was largely taken up by the imperial palace. Here at Sozopolis the Palace of the Archangel (no. 142) was perhaps an inner citadel of this type.
- (3) In view of both the wording and the lettering, it is hard to disagree with Mommsen's dating of the charter to Diocletian or even later, especially when it is compared with the Constantinian charter of Orkistos (Hermes xxii, 1887, p. 321)

Apollonia and TymandosInscriptions

137. GENCALI, in a field 1.5 km. N of the village, 100 m. from the shore of the lake. Limestone miliarium, broken below. H. 114 plus, diam. (above) 58, lett. 3 - 4. Pl. 24 .

Imp. Caes. Septimius

SevrusPius Pertinax

Aug. Arabicus Adiabe-

nicus Parthicus Ma-

5. ximus pontifex max.

trib. pot. vi. imp. xi. cos.ii

p.p. procos. et Imp.

Caes. M. Aur. Antoni-

nus. Aug. cos. Part(hicus)

10. Maximus restitue-

runt per<per> T.Atticiu-

m Norbanum Strabonem

leg. Aug. pr. pr. mil. pass.

xxiix

Letters underlined were read by Pace in 1914.

11. 1-2 The traces of letters at the end of line 2 are consistent with the reading given, but do not impose it. There are remains of a second and probably later inscription on this part of the stone, but they are virtually illegible and as far as possible have been omitted from the drawing.

1.6 Pace read trib. pot viii.

1.11 Reading based on that of Pace.

11. 12-13 Some of the letters are of minuscule form, as in other milestones of Atticius Strabo (e.g. below, no. /65).

The dating is problematical. According to Cagnat (Cours, p. 209) Caracalla did not become Parthicus Maximus until 199 or consul until 202, when Severus was trib. pot. x Imp. xi. The reading given here for line 6 supposes a date in the latter part of 198, which agrees with the date of at least two of the other known milestones of Atticius Strabo (SERP p. 172, no. 56 = CR xix, 1905, p. 416, no. 7; PIR(2) i, p. 269, no. 1331,3 = ? that mentioned in JRS xvi, 1926, p. 105). It is possible that the hand-written text from which these milestones were engraved gave the tribunician power of Severus as vi owing to confusion with Caracalla, whose sixth tribunician power corresponded with Severus' eleventh. This would explain the reference to Caracalla as consul and Parthicus Maximus, and date both the milestones and the governorship of Atticius Strabo to 202-3.

The praenomen of Atticius is given in two other milestones (SERP p. 173, no. 58; A.M. Ramsay, Report to the Wilson Trustees for 1909 (privately printed 1910), no. 6) as C(aius). In the other known examples the praenomen has been lost.

Published with differences by B.Pace, Ann. d. R. Scuola Arch. in Atene etc., iii, 1916-1920, p. 51, no. 39 = Ann. Ep. 1922, no. 5.

138. ULUBORLU, in the Ismet Paşa school, said to have been formerly in a mosque in the citadel. White marble architrave, without upper moulding, plain behind, the front divided into three fasciae, all originally inscribed. On the original upper

surface, a two-line inscription in Arabic characters. The stone appears to be complete except at the lower left, but may have been neatly recut. H. 30, w. 89, th. 24, lett. (1.1) 3.2 - 4.0, (1.2) 2.8 - 3.2, (1.3) 2.3 - 3.0. Pl.24.

...φιλῶν τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ εὐεργετή[ν---
 ---εἰκόνη] χρυσοῦ ἐφίππῳ καὶ νδω[---
 ---ἰσίοις ἀνελ]ωμῶσιν συν τοῖς τῶν π[αίδων] ---

1.4 Probably an ancient erasure. There was perhaps originally a fifth line.

139. ULUBORLU, in the outer wall of Sait Bey's house on the NE of the town. White limestone fragment, apparently complete below. H. 32 plus, w. 33 plus, th. -, lett. 3.9 - 4.2. Pl.24.

...]τερον[---
 ...]πρεσβει[---
 ...]παις vac. leaf[---
 5. ...]δοσεσι vac[---
 ...]ατριδι leaf τη[---

140. ULUBORLU, in the wall of Sait Bey's garden. Fragment of white limestone architrave, apparently complete above, upper moulding defaced. H. 35 plus, w. 49 plus, th. -, lett. 14.5 - 15.5. Pl.24.

...? ἀγω]νοθ[ετήσας ?

No facsimile; drawn from sketch. Probably part of the inscription restored in MAMA iv, no. 139.

141. ULUBORLU, in the wall of Sait Bey's garden. Fragment of architrave, apparently complete above, upper moulding defaced. H. 38 plus, w. 30 plus, th. -, lett. (1.1) 9.5 - 10.0, (1.2) c.8. Pl. 24

--]εΡΤ[
 ---]τηριδ[---

1.2 probably an architectural term, e.g. σφαιριστήριον or ἐρξιστήριον.

142. ULUBORLU, in the threshold of Bahçe Cami'i. Limestone block. H. 40, w. 67, th. 24, lett. 2.5 - 4.0. In the centre of the inscription is what appears to have been an incised Latin cross, later defaced by a circular sinking (depth 1.5) and a channel running from it to the upper edge of the stone. Pl. 25.

[Δ]ΥΔΥΕΟΥΤΕ
 ΤΟ ΠΑΛΑΤΙΝ
 ΤΟΥ ΑΡΧΑΝ-
 ΓΕΛΟΥ ΕΤΟΥΣ Ε-

5. ΞΑΚΟΣΙΟΕΤΟΥ
 ΕΒΔΟΜΙΚΟΤ[Ο]Υ Η'

11. 2-3 Normally, even in very late Greek, an imperial palace; here possibly the residence of some imperial official. The name "Palace of the Archangel" was perhaps derived from its proximity to a church of St. Michael; compare the Palaces of St. Theodora and of St. Zacharias at Constantinople (R. Janin, Constantinople Byzantine, Paris, 1950, p. 144).

Date 653/4 or 645/6 (Galatian era); 647/8 or 639/40 (Actian era)

Published, MAMA iv, no. 225.

143. ULUBORLU, behind a house on the new main street. Cylindrical limestone bomos, with ox-heads and swags in relief. H. 85, diam. 41, 39-43, 46, lett. 3. Pl. P8.

Δίος

144. At a crossroads about 1 km. of Uluborlu. Bomos with pedimental top, slightly broken above. On the base-line of the pediment a small boss. H. 93, plus, w. 40, 36, 42, th. 34, 33-37, 39, lett. 2.5 - 3.2. Pl. 25.

[A] ὑρ. Ἀμειδ τῶ ε-
 [α] τῆς ἀνδρὶ <ν>
 [A] ὑξάνοντι
 [κ] ἐ τέκνοις
 5. [γ] λυκντάτοις
 [μν] ἡμης χάριν
 leaf.

1.2 The last letter seems to be N, perhaps inserted to avoid a hiatus before the vowel that follows it.

145. At a crossroads 3 km. SW of Uluborlu. Limestone bomos, broken above. H. 47 plus, w. -, 31, 49, th. -, 31, -, lett. 1.7 - 2.6. Pl. 25.

[-----]
 [A] ὑρ. γλ' α A [-----]
 [E] τυχου τη! λυκν-
 [τ] ἀτη γυνδικι μου
 5. μνήμης χάριν
 leaf.

146. MAHMUTLAR, 2-3 km. from Uluborlu on the road to Inhisar, in a field wall. Limestone block or stele, moulded below, broken above and below. H. 45 plus, w. 63, th. -, lett. 3.5.Pl.25.

οὐ δινον το θλνει [v]
πριν ἡλεικιδν κε γονεων
προτερος ; vac

The main epigraph was presumably higher up the shaft.

147. Uluborlu, in an orchard below the town. Limestone stele with gabled pediment, slightly broken above. In the pediment, defaced relief. H. 102 plus, w. 44, 40, 44, th. 38, 38, 43, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. Pl.25.

Μητρόδωρος
Σωτηρίχου
φυσι δὲ Αλεξάνδρ-
ου Τάτα Μεννδίου
5. τῇ εἰσὶα γυναικεῖ
γλυκυτάτῃ μνήμῃ [s]
[χάρ]ιν. Μητρόδωρος
β' τῇ εἰσὶα τεκούση
μνήμης Χάριν
leaf

148. ULUBORLU, in the porch of Bahçe Cami'i. Plain limestone cylinder, inscribed on one end; broken left. Diam. 42, th. 42, lett. 2 - 2.8. Pl.25.

[ὅς] ὧν κλκλ's
χε]ρ's προσοισει

[τω ἡ]ρωιω τουτω vac
 ? [ἡ ποι]ησεν οἰκοδομημα Β-
 5. [---]s τῷ τοπω ἡ ἐξ ὑπο-
 ? [θη]κης τινος κλκυργη-
 [σει ἐ]στε αὐτοῖς προ[s]
 [τ]ην κρισιν την
vac. Θεου vac

149. ULUBORLU, in the Ismet Paşa School. Cylindrical bomos. H. 161, diam. 27, 23-26, 30. Round the upper moulding, a series of eyes; on the shaft, in relief, aedicula with seated figure in cloak and Phrygian cap, holding a small object in either hand; uninscribed. Pl. 25.

150. YASSI VIRAN, in a lane. Stele with pediment and lateral pilasters; between the capitals of the pilasters, swag supported by ox-heads; on the shaft, vine, bill-hook and defaced bust? Faint traces of inscription in the pediment and along the upper moulding. Broken above. H. 138, w. 55, 50-53, 55, th. 24. Pl. Pz.

151. SENIRKENT, in the wall of the Turan Primary School. Plain block with vine and bill-hook in relief. H. 66, w. 99, th. -. Uninscribed. Pl. 26.

152. ULUBORLU, outside the Mosque of Ala'eddin. White marble slab with circular hollow decorated with radiating flutes meeting in a central raised boss. At the corners, defaced mouldings resembling capitals; across each end, rectangular area with

semicircular ends, left rough probably as seating for an elongated "double column". Probably the floor of an elaborate ambo. Both long sides trimmed off at a later date. H. 27, w. 172, th. 123, diam. of hollow 126. Pl. P8.

GALATIA SALUTARIS
The Area of Amorion

Amorion was identified by Hamilton (Researches i, pp.449-455) at Hergan Kale, now Asar (or Hisar) Köyü, 13 km. E of Aziziye (Emirdağ). The correctness of this identification, which has been generally accepted, is finally confirmed by no. 153, erected by the agent at Amorion in charge of collecting the portorium dues on the frontier of Asia and Galatia, which ran, until the Diocletianic reorganisation of the provinces, a little to the E of Amorion.

Hamilton's description of the site is considerably fuller than could now be given, and it is unfortunate that he does not supplement it with a plan. The citadel mound, which represents the accumulated debris of a large Phrygian and earlier town, is about 300 m. from N to S, 200 m. from E to W and 15 m. high. The walls, built of reused blocks including a large percentage of Roman gravestones, can still be traced round most of the circuit of the citadel.* Within it, there are slight traces of a small apsidal building, probably a church. In Hamilton's time "all was ruin and confusion, though lines of streets and houses were still visible".

The city stretched a considerable distance to S and W of the citadel, but apart from some traces of its fortifications and a large rectangular area like a military camp[†] (perhaps the "gymnasium" mentioned by Hamilton) no individual buildings can be distinguished. A thorough survey of the site, for which I was not equipped at the time of my visit, might reveal many other

* Pl. P8, B

† Pl. P8, A

points of interest. The extent of the site and the high quality of some of the architectural remains found there (e.g. the Byzantine capitals MAMA i, no. 433; vi, no. 416) fully bear out the literary testimony to its importance during the Byzantine period and particularly during the Arab wars (HGAM, p. 231), when it blocked the E-W road through the plain between the Sangarios and Emir Dağı, ^{which} was the easiest route from the Cilician Gates to Dorylaion and Kotiaion. It is generally assumed that the site at Aşağı Piribeyli 28 km. ESE of Amorion was the Pissia of the Notitiae (HGAM pp. 232 f.; MAMA vii, p. xix) although, as pointed out by Keil (RE s.v. Pissia), there is no reason why it should have been. Indeed, since Pissia is known only as a bishopric of comparatively late date, a high proportion of Byzantine inscriptions would have been expected there; out of the 20 stones from Aşağı Piribeyli published in MAMA vii (pp. 57 ff.) only one is of Byzantine type. An alternative, which seems at least as likely, though also not supported by Byzantine inscriptions, is that Pissia was the later name of Peisea (JHS xviii, 1898, pp. 114 f.; MAMA vii, no. 133), the modern Bise, SW of Philomelion.

Two mounds, one S of Piribeyli, the other SW, as well as a flat area W of the village, now used as a cemetery, are strewn with late Roman and early Byzantine pottery. It was an obvious site for a settlement, having plenty of water and lying at the N end of the valley separating Emir Dağı from the hills that surround the modern Yunak through which at least one road must have passed (p. 169 f.).

Samıt, about 5 km. SSE of Piribeyli, is also a fairly large

Roman and Byzantine site (about 30 acres of miserably poor-looking ruins just to the E of the mound on which the Dede stands).

The Area of Amorion

Inscriptions

153. ASAR, in the yard of a house below the SW corner of the citadel. Limestone block, originally moulded above and below on all sides except perhaps the left. Complete but mouldings defaced. H. 96, w. 128, th. 57, lett. 5 - 8. Pl.26, from impression only.

diis Manibus Bellici.

Isochrysus sociorum

p(ublici) xxxx p(ortoriorum) A(siae) villic(us) Amuri
f(ecit)

ll. 2-3 For the formula cf. CIL iii, 447 (7149), 7153.

Amorion is however the first certainly known inland station of the portoria Asiae (see S.J.de Laet, Portorium, Brugge, 1949, pp. 75 f., 278 ff.). The mention of socii is of little use in dating the inscription, as the portoria of Asia were still in private hands until the late 2nd century (RE s.v. Portorium, col. 393).

154. HAMZAHACILI, in the wall of the mosque yard. Upper part of doorstone, broken below. H. 88 plus, w. 64, th. -, lett. 1.3 - 6.0. Pl.26, from impression only.

Οὐ νοῦτος καὶ
Ἀνμὶδ Ἰωντες ἐδντοῖς ἐπ-
οιήσαν μνήμης χάριν

155. SAMIT, recently excavated on a hill E of the Dede. Triple doorstone of greyish-white local marble, broken below. H. 105 plus, w. 202, th. 34, 30, lett. 3.5 - 4.0. In the upper panels of the doors 1) knocker, 2) key-plate, 3) four-petalled flower, 4) bunch of grapes, 5) knocker, 6) key-plate. Pl. 26.

Ἀλδίκη Θίειω ἀνδρὶ γλυκυτάτῳ.

The inscription is complete.

156. ASAR, in a yard near the SW corner of the citadel. Limestone doorstone with lateral pilasters, broken above. H. 148 plus, w. 68, 76, th. 52, 56, lett. 2.0 - 4.2. In the panels 1) boss, 2) key-plate, 3) defaced, 4) flower. Pl. 26, from impression only.

φ(λάβιος?) Ὀρεστος Ἀ-
κυλου Φουρίο-
υ θίω ἰσίω μν-
ήμης χάριν.

157. AŞAĞI PIRİBEYLLI, near the top of the mound S of the village. Doorstone of fine-grained whitish marble, broken above, below and left. H. 132 plus, w. 82 plus, th. 39, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. In the panels, 1) draped male figure, 2) draped female figure, 3) and 4) ivy-scroll. On the lateral pilasters, vine-scroll. Pl. P8. ἡ δεινὴ τοῦ δεινὸς ἐ[κ]αυτῇ καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ ὑ[πο]ί[σ].

158. ASAR, on the S side of the citadel, Limestone doorstone.

H. 143, w. 72, 69, th. 46, 42, lett. 3.5 - 5.0. In the panels,
1) ring, 2) key-plate, 3) and 4) objects resembling buckets.

Pl. 27.

Ῥοῦφίλλη Λουιδν̄
ω τέκνω γλυκυτάτῳ
μνήμης χάριν

11. 1-2. The lapicide originally cut Λουιδν̄ but corrected
it to Λουιδν̄ω ; cf. Λουιδν̄ή in MAMA vii, no. 556.

159. ASAGI PIRIBEYLI, in a lane. Upper part of limestone bomos,
with relief of eagle with wings spread; broken below and right.

H. 46 plus, w. 72 plus, th. 33, lett. 2 - 3. Pl. 27.

Αὐρ Ζωτικ] ὁς Μενελάου κὲ Αὐρ. Αἰμυλ
[Δημητρί]ω κὲ Κδρικῳ υἱοῖς [μνήμης]
[Χάριν]

Restoration exempli gratia. The surface of part of the
inscribed portion has broken away completely.

160. ASAR, in the wall of the citadel, on the S side. Limestone
doorstone, broken above. H. 150 plus, w. 70, th. 45, lett. 3.5.
In the panels 1) ring, 2) key-plate, 3) defaced, 4) four-
-petalled flower. Pl. 26, from impression only.

[-----]
2δελφῇ leaf μνήμης χα[p]
[iv]

161. ASAR, in a lane. Doorstone of grey crystalline marble.

H. 140, w. 59, th. 40, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. In the panels, 1) ring,

2) key-plate, 3) mason's hammer, 4) bill-hook. Above the door, pediment with acroteria; on the lateral pilasters, vine-scroll. Pl. 27.

[v]ω Αλεξάνδρω [κδ]
 [π]ατρι Μόνη καὶ μ[ητρι]
 [-----]
 [----- μνημης]

5. Χάριν.

ll. 3-4 have been completely erased and replaced by the signature of a Turk, Ali Yilm(az). On the base is an isolated T, probably also modern.

162. ASAR, in an open space near the mosque. MAMA vii, no. 297. In my own photograph, admittedly not a very good one, there is no sign of a cross in the conch over the door. The suspension of the fish from a cross-bar can perhaps be explained by the custom, still prevalent on parts of the Black Sea coast, of carrying fish by means of a string passed through the gills and attached to a piece of twig or reed about four inches long, which serves as a handle and obviates the need of wrapping-paper. The appearance of a fish so treated is exactly as portrayed on MAMA vii, nos. 297-8. This does not fully explain the pairs of fish in ibid., nos. 277, 279, suspended from bars resting on single horizontal uprights.

163. ASAR, in an excavation below the NW side of the citadel. On the right side of a defaced doorstone, apparently reused in the Byzantine wall and recently fallen from it. H. 51, w. 182,

th. 90, lett. 4.5 - 7.0. Not illustrated.

vac. ΤΕΚΤΟΝΙΚΩΝ vac

The text is apparently complete and probably marks a quarter of the city, belonging to the same series as MAMA vii, no. 301. The letters are of similar form.

164. ASAR, in a yard. Coarse marble block in the shape of an ossuary or small sarcophagus, with rounded top, decorated with Aeolic half-columns and plain corner-pilasters. H. 36, w. 41, th. 29, uninscribed. Pl. 26 .

LYKAONIA and TYANITIS

Geography : unlike Phrygia, Lykaonia does not lend itself to treatment piecemeal, one valley at a time. Here the plain, with varying degrees of flatness, runs unbroken from Amorion eastwards to Tyana and from Laranda northwards to the N end of Lake Tatta. The mountain ranges within this area are isolated and with the solitary exception of Boz Dag have little effect on the main lines of communication.

Strabo, in his account of Lykaonia (568), gives a grim picture of waterless plains grazed by wild asses and by Amyntas' flocks. The wild asses have been driven out, but the distant descendants of Amyntas' sheep were until a few years ago practically the only means of livelihood of the inhabitants.

The plain is bordered on the SE and SW by the main ridge of the Taurus, which rises in places to over 3000 m.; the hills of Morimene on the NE and those of Galatia on the NW form a lesser but still perceptible barrier. The area thus enclosed is approximately 100 km. square and stands for the most part about 1000 m. above sea level. It is generally flat or gently rolling, and its flatness is accentuated by three ranges of mountains rising steeply out of it.

Kara Dağ (2271 m.), near the southern corner of the plain, is a solid mass of grey and dull red trachyte surrounded by a few conical outliers. Karaca Dağ, further to the NE, is a long ridge running NE-SW and dividing Lykaonia proper from Tyanitis.

Boz Dag[✓], on the west, a long chain of hills rarely rising more than 500 m. out of the plain, cuts off the plain of Ikonion from the rest of Lykaonia, but can be crossed at several points. From the top of Boz Dag[✓] on a clear day, one can see the whole of Lykaonia spread out before one's feet, with the salt-flats of Tatta gleaming whitely on one hand, the highest peaks of the Taurus rising in a solid wall on the other, and between them Hasan Dag[✓], a great volcanic cone all the more impressive in its isolation.

A belt of low rolling hills runs right across from Boz Dag[✓] to Hasan Dag[✓] and divides the plain into two main catchment areas; the northern of these is centred on Lake Tatta, while the southern one, drawing most of its water from the streams of the Taurus, loses it in a series of lakes and marshes, of varying salinity, that stretches from near Ikonion right across to Kybistra.

Lykaonia is a country of strange contrasts, of isolated mountains rising from seemingly endless plains, marshes alternating with wind-blown sand and pumice-dust, desolate saltflats and most surprising of all, the foothills of the Taurus around Kybistra, where the hedges meet over the lanes and trout swim in the clear, cold water of the streams.

The climate is a hard one, hot and dry in summer, bitterly cold in winter, with a brief interval of warm, wet weather in spring and early summer, when for a few weeks the whole landscape is covered with grass, red anemones and white daisies. Autumn is the best time to travel, when the sun has lost its heat and the tracks are still dry.

Such rainfall as there is falls mainly in the spring, and

in a good year will support a good crop of barley or wheat in the damper parts of the plain. In antiquity the area under cultivation was probably much smaller than it is today, but by no means as small as it was a generation ago, before the advent of mechanisation made it possible to grow a thin crop economically.

Even drinking-water is scarce in many districts. At Savatra the ancient city was supplied by underground springs in the floor of a valley leading down from Boz Dağ; but in the plain a mile or two from Boz Dağ the wells are over 50 m. deep and even then the water is bad. Here sheep are still an important factor in the economy, and twenty years ago, as in the time of Amyntas, they were the only means of livelihood of the bulk of the population. Even Boz Dağ is changing fast, but it will be many years before the courtesy and hospitality of its inhabitants are exchanged for the suspicion and hostility of the Synnada area or the commercialism that is creeping up the Maeander Valley.

Along the southern edge of the plains there are enough perennial streams to allow a certain amount of irrigation. Recently great progress has been made with schemes drawing their water from the Çarşamba, south of Lystra, and from the streams in the foothills east of Laranda. How much of this development is in origin modern, is hard to say, but the great number of ancient settlements in the Çarşamba area suggests that it is not. There is no natural drainage to the sea, and beyond the irrigated fringe of the plain there must always have been areas of brackish or salt marshland where the waste water finally evaporated.

The principal ancient towns were those in the irrigated areas. Of the seven cities of the Koinon of Lykaonia that are

known to have struck their own coins in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D., four can be identified with certainty and three of these, Laranda, Derbe and Ilistra, certainly had some sort of opportunity for irrigation, while the fourth, Savatra, must always have depended for its wealth on sheep and on its position as a road-centre. Of the other three, Dalisandos is quite uncertain, while Hyde and Barata, if correctly placed by Ramsay at Karapınar and Madensehir respectively (pp. 230, 242), must have come in the same category as Savatra.

The Central Anatolian plain is, and always has been, agriculturally poor, depending on subsistence agriculture and semi-nomadic pasturage, but it had at all periods a certain importance in the road-system of Asia Minor. All the roads connecting Pergamon, Ephesos and Constantinople to Syria and the northern part of the Euphrates frontier took advantage of its flatness, and in spite of the exactions of the Roman Imperial posting system, must have contributed to its prosperity. Indeed many of the ancient settlements in the plain, such as those at Karapınar and Ortakuyu, must have existed largely because of the roads on which they lay.

Ancient Roads in Lykaonia. The earliest east-west route through Lykaonia of which we have detailed knowledge from classical sources is that followed by Cyrus the Younger in 401, which ran from Keramon Agora via Thymbrion and Ikonion to Tyana (Xenophon Anab. i, 11 ff.). His road seems to be a modification of the line proposed for the Royal Road by Professor Calder (CR, xxxix, 1925, pp. 7 ff.). This line, through Laodikeia and

Savatra to Kybistra, would have been excellent for couriers but too barren to support an army. Between Ikonion and Tyana Cyrus' road presumably ran along the south side of the plain, through Laranda, this being the only route capable of supplying his army with food and drinking-water, and it was probably a road from Laranda to the Cilician coast at Korykos that was taken by Menon on his march to outflank the Cilician force holding the Gates. Xenophon's distance of 50 parasangs from Ikonion to Tyana suits this route well.

Strabo, four centuries later, says little explicitly on the subject of roads, but his distances, 300 stadia from Tyana to Kybistra (539) and 120 from Garsaoura to Koropassos (568) were presumably measured along roads, while his mention of Savatra (*ibid.*) as a town near Garsaoura can only be due to its having been connected to the latter by a road.

Without straining Strabo's evidence too far, it is permissible to conclude that he knew of two roads across the plain, one from Garsaoura (Archelais, Aksaray) via Savatra to Ikonion, the other from Tyana to Kybistra and thence either to Laranda and Isaura or to Perta and Laodikeia Katakekaumene.

Cicero on his way to Tarsus in 51 B.C. gives no indication of his route from Ikonion to Kybistra, and appears to have had no interest whatever in the geography of his province.

Pliny and Ptolemy are equally unconcerned with roads, and it is not until the fourth century A.D. that we have a connected picture of the road-system of Central Anatolia, in the Peutinger Table, which has suffered much from the usual defect of scribal errors and far more from irresponsible emendation. The Lykaonian

section of the Table omits a great deal and mangles some of the place-names badly, but it is certainly correct in its main lines and even the distances between stations are often accurate.

I have discussed elsewhere details of some of the roads crossing the Lykaonian Plain (AS viii, pp. 223-234, a copy of which will be found in the folder of plates). The purpose of that article was mainly to show that the eastern part of the road given by the Table as running from Abrostola to Tyana did in fact exist, and that the distances and stations were probably correct.

This does not of course mean that the remainder of the Table is equally capable of verification, but it seems reasonable that the Table should be given the chance of clearing itself of the grave charges of inaccuracy that have been made against it (e.g. HGAM, pp. 62 ff., 357 ff.).

In the last fifty years our knowledge of the topography of Lykaonia, both ancient and modern, has improved enormously, and the Turkish 1 : 200,000 map, while a poor one by most European standards, is an enormous advance on any of its predecessors. As a result, we are now in a far better position to assess the value of the Peutinger Table than were Ramsay, Anderson and Miller in the early years of the century.

The Table as it stands is obviously incomplete. Among the omissions in the section discussed here are several long stretches of road, notably in southern Lykaonia, and a number of individual stations elsewhere. The long roads Ikonion-Side and Isaura-Anemourion have no stations marked at all. But there is only one part of this section of the Table where the general

sense is not clear; that is in the road given as Ikonion-Soloi, itself a very unlikely line, and ⁱⁿ its junction with the south coast road.

In the accompanying map (pl. 44), the whole of the Peutinger Table for Lykaonia, together with the areas surrounding it, has been drawn out to scale, showing the distances in Roman miles both according to the Table (Roman numerals) and as measured on the 1 : 200,000 map, with allowance for bends (Arabic numerals). A number of sections of road have been added, (in broken line) as well as a number of probable stations not given by the Table (in brackets).

The only additions for which I can find no positive archaeological or literary evidence are.

- 1) The road from Ankyra to Ikonion (but see pp.164f)
- 2) That from Laranda to Sidamaria (p.178).
- 3) That from Savatra to Kybistra (p.172).
- 4) That from Abrostola to Philomelion and Antiocheia (p.170).

The only conscious omissions are.

- 1) The stations between Parnassos and Archelais, which are out of order on the Table, as compared with the Antonine and Jerusalem Itineraries (pp.166f).

2) The phrases in monte and in monte Tauro occurring in the region of the Cilician Gates. It has been assumed that Tarso was omitted here, because of its close resemblance to Tauro, and that the distance XXX, given after Tauro, belongs to another of the roads radiating from Tarsus, possibly that to Zephyrion, though the distance is in fact too long (pp.173f).

- 3) The junction of the road given as Ikonion-Soloi is

problematical. I have brought this road down to the coast at Seleukeia or Korykos. It is possible that there was a road from Olba to Pompeiopolis, but it would be an extremely difficult line, cutting across the lie of the country, and would not have been the quickest route between the two. I have assumed that Crunis XXIII, marked near Seleukeia, belongs to the coast road.

Detailed Analysis. To avoid confusion, each road is marked on the map with a letter corresponding to the paragraph below, in which the road is treated. The divisions are arbitrary but correspond as far as possible to main through routes.

A. Given by the Table as Pesinunte xxiii Abrostola xxiii Amurio xi Abrostola xxiii Tolosocorio vii Bagrum xx Verisso xx Egdava xx Pegella xx Congusso xv Petra xx Comitannasso xii Ubinnaca xxix Salaberina.

The only certainly identified stations are Pessinous, Amorion and Perta (RE, s.v. Pessinous; above p. 146, below p. 201). Of the rest, Vetissos (Verisso) Gdanmaa (Egdava) and Kouamitanassos (Comitannasso), are known from inscriptions that do not entirely guarantee their locations. The demos of Vetissos made a dedication to Meter Andeirene at Sarı Kaya, and Vetissos may have been either there or at Sülüklü 15 km. to the NE (MAMA vii, p. xxiv). Gdanmaa or Gdammaua is mentioned in epitaphs at Çerkes Atlandı (MAMA vii, pp. xxii f.) and Çeşmeli Zebir (MAMA i, no. 339) and has been put at the latter (MAMA vii, pp. xxii f.). Kouamitanassos is vouched for by a dedication (AS. viii, 1958, pp. 227f), which guarantees the name but not the position. The size of the site^{at Ortakuyu} and its position exactly where

the Table marks Comitanasso leave little doubt that it was Kouamitanassos.

Of the stations for which there is no epigraphic evidence at all, Abrostola is the most problematic. The Table marks it twice, once between Pessinous and Amorion and once between Amorion and Tolosocorio (presumably the Tolastochora of Ptolemy V, 4, 7). On the map, Abrostola is provisionally put at Veledler (JHS xix, 1899, p. 310), for lack of a better site. Apart from the fact that it was in Asia (Ptolemy V, 2, 23) nothing else is known of Abrostola. The Table puts it 24 m.p. from Pessinous and 23 (or 11) m.p. from Amorion, whereas Veledler is only 11 m.p. from Pessinous. Anderson's site for Tolastochora ($1\frac{1}{2}$ hrs. N of Çeltik) is only 15 m.p. from Veledler or 24 from Pessinous, and his restoration (JHS *ibid.*) of the two roads as Pessinous xi Abrostola xvii Amorion and Pessinous xxiv Tolastochora vii Bagrum is satisfactory so far as it goes, though it brings Tolosocorio too far west in relation to Vetissos if the latter is correctly placed at Sülüklü. On the whole it seems better to leave Abrostola as the junction and put Tolosocorio further east. But the whole problem deserves another examination on the ground. Bagrum, the next station, is quite uncertain. Vetissos and Gdanmaa have been mentioned above. Sarıkaya is rather more on the line of the road than Sülüklü, and this may be in its favour as the site of Vetissos. Beyond Gdanmaa, two alternatives are open. The road either headed straight for Perta, via Azak and Zivarık, in which case one of the distances given by the Table is too long, or it kept further to the south and passed through the valley between Sarnıç and Mernek, in which case the distance

(55 m.p.) is correct, but no site is available for Congusso except a miserable mound near Sarnıç, which can hardly have been more than a farm. On the whole, the direct route is much the more likely of the two; working back from Perta at Giymir (p.201) it would have crossed the pass by Zengicek Kale (p.191) and descended to Zívarık, which is 15 m.p. from Perta and must on this theory be the Congusso of the Table.(p.190). Psebila, put at Zívarık by Ramsay, could equally well be at Toprak Kale further to the north (pp.191f).

The only ancient site of any importance between Zívarık and Çeşmeli Zebir (Gdanmaa?) is at Azak, 20 m.p. from the former and 11 from the latter (MAMA vii, p. xxiii). If Azak is Pegella, the error in the Table distance from Gdanmaa to Perta can be localised here.

Beyond Perta, the road struck boldly across the Lykaonian plain heading for Salaberina, 20 m.p.-S of Archelais, according to the Table, on a road passing round the W and S sides of Hasan Dağı to Tyana (section C). There is a perfectly possible site for Salaberina at Gideriç near Taşpınar; the intermediate stations Comitanasso and Ubinnaca have been put at Ortakuyu and Malır Hk. respectively (AS viii, pp. 227 ff.). A road from Archelais via Koropassos to Savatra and Ikonion probably crossed this road at Kouamitanassos or Ubinnaca (section G).

There are no milestones that can be attributed with certainty to the ^{stretch} Abrostola - Salaberina, though several of the group at Obruk (AS viii, p. 230, nos 1, 4, 5, 9, 17, 32-34, 38, 39) probably belong to it. The distance given in one of these (loc. cit. no. 33), if restored as $\lambda\rho'$, corresponds very closely to

the actual distance from Abrostola. A milestone at Zívarik with the distance $\rho\epsilon$ (loc. cit. no. 15) corresponds equally closely, but may have belonged to a road from Ankyra to Ikonion (Section B). It is dangerous to try to account for distances on these milestones too closely, as many of them have probably been carried some distance. The importance of both Obruk and Zívarik in early Turkish times makes the stones there particularly suspect.

Section B. This road is a composite one, consisting of one from Ankyra to Ikonion not given by the Table, and one from Ikonion to Anemourion given in abbreviated form as Yconio-Taspa xxiiii Isaria xv Animurio.

As Anderson concluded sixty years ago, there must have been a road of sorts from Ankyra to Ikonion, although there is no positive evidence for it (JHS xix, 1899, p. 117). Its point of junction with the "Pilgrims' Road" Ankyra-Archelais must have been at Ahiboz, where the Pilgrims' Road turned east (JHS xix, p. 103, pl. iv; milestones at Ahiboz AS iv, 1954, p. 120, nos. 7a, 7b). The line suggested by Anderson, down the W side of Karaca Dağ to Kozanlı, seems likely. Beyond Kozanlı there are two possibilities. The road may have run through Çeşmeli Zebir and Zengen, where a milestone (MAMA i, no. 372) bears the distances $\overline{\text{XV}}$ (from Ankyra?) and $\overline{\text{LIV}}$ (from $\overline{\text{I}}$ con(ium)). The distance Ankyra to Zengen is 126 m.p. (by the map; MAMA loc.cit. gives it as 129 $\frac{1}{2}$) while that from Ikonion by the shortest route 46 m.p. or, via Laodikeia, 51 m.p. The secondary inscription $\overline{\text{MA}}$ also appears to be a distance. The stone is not of such a character that a Turk would be likely to carry it far from its

original position. From Zengen to Ikonion the natural route would be straight across the plain to the Bağrı̇kurt pass and then along the line of the modern road via Dokuzun Hanı̇.

The alternative line from Kozanlı̇ to Ikonion would have run more or less along the line of the modern road, via Çorca Hk., İnevi and Zıvarık. The distance is about the same as by the western route; two milestones (AS viii, p. 230, nos. 8, 15) at Tutup and Zıvarık respectively, give distances that are almost exactly right on the assumption that the fork at Ahiboz was the caput viae. That at Tutup, reading $\eta\rho'$ is 119 m.p. from Ahiboz, or 119 from Amorion by the south Lykaonian road (Section D); that at Zivarik, reading $\rho\epsilon'$, is 105 from Ahiboz, but 103 (or 107, according to the position assigned to Vetissos) from Veledler on the north Lykaonian road (Section A).

From Ikonion to Anemourion the Table's indications are terribly fragmentary; Yconio - Taspā XXIIII Isaria XV Animurio. The road may have run through the plain as far as the Çarşamba river or, more probably, cut into the low hills to pass through Lystra and Kavak. Taspā could be a mistake for Lystra (Lycaonia cols. 87 f.) but is more likely to have been further S, as Lystra is about 39 m.p. from Isaura. Between Lystra and Isaura there are no particular natural lines; the presence of milestones at Kavak (CIL iii, nos. 6958, 12215) suggests that it lay on this route (see also Section E). It is likely that the road went to E of the direct line, crossing the Çarşamba at Apasaraycık and approaching Isaura (Zengibîr Kalesi) from NE. Further west the Çarşamba flows in a gorge and the surrounding country is much rougher.

From Isaura a road is marked to Anemourion. Here there is no natural line at all, and the road must have been a steep and winding track linking up a series of little cities and villages. It can hardly have been a through route in the sense that any individual traveller would have started at one end of it and finished at the other, but it would have provided an outlet to both the sea and the Plateau for the inhabitants of cities such as Germanikopolis (Ermenek). The one distance given by the Table on this stretch xv m.p., might belong to the stage Isaura - Astra. (Tamaşalik; WE, pp. 46 f.). Sterrett, one of the hardest and least complaining of travellers, gives a very discouraging account of this area (WE, pp. 79 ff.).

Section C. [Ancyra]xxx Nitazer xxi Aspasi xii Aspona x Garmias xii Corveunte xxii [Archelais]xx Salaberina xvi Caena xvi Tracias xvi Tyana.

The text is corrupt, as the most superficial comparison with the Antonine and Jerusalem Itineraries shows clearly. Neither Ankyra nor Archelais is named on the Table, though both are marked by vignettes. Perhaps as a result of this, the copyist has reversed the order of the intermediate stations and has omitted enough of the distances to make his total distance 107 m.p. as compared with the 149 m.p. of the Antonine and 160 of the Jerusalem Itineraries. The northern section of the Itinerary road has been convincingly worked out by Anderson (JHS, xix, 1899, pp. 100 ff.), and there is no point in simply emending the Table to give the same stations and distances. It is possible that the road shown on the Table is not in all respects

the same as that of the Itineraries. For instance, it is not necessary to assume that the Garmias of the Table is the same as the Aliassum of the Itinerary. It may also have passed along the E shore of Lake Tatta instead of taking the higher route via Parnassos (Parlasan), although Aspasi could easily be a mistake for Parnasi. Between Parnassos and Archelais the fact that Nitazer in various forms appears also in the Itineraries suggests that the Table took substantially the same route as they did, but it is quite uncertain whether this was along the lake-shore or up the better-supplied but marshier and less direct Beçenek Özü (AS, viii, 1958, pp, 233 f.). A milestone of Macrinus and Diadumenian now about 10 m.p. NW of Archelais (AS, loc.cit. no. 2), referring to the building of a new road, suggests that two separate roads were in use at various times. The milestone almost certainly stood on the lake-shore route (i.e. the modern road Koçhisar - Aksaray), though it is just possible that the two roads joined one another not at Archelais but near Cimeliveysfakili, where the milestone was found, in which case it might belong to either.

Archelais stood on the same site as the modern Aksaray, where a large mound with good quality Roman pottery has recently been exposed by the demolition of some old buildings.

Beyond Archelais the Peutinger Table route differs entirely from that taken by the Itineraries, both of which give a road round the N and E sides of Hasan Dağı. The Table's road runs S for 20 m.p. to Salaberina, where it meets the North Lykaonian Road coming from Abrostola (Section A). This route is taken by the modern road Aksaray - Bor - Tarsus; although much of the

country along it is bare and inhospitable it is not at all difficult. The first stage, from Archelais to Salaberina, has been described in AS viii (p. 225), and the site at Gideriç, 4 m.p. S of Taşpınar, corresponds closely to the position given by the Table for Salaberina. From here the road must have struck S to round the spur on which the Byzantine castle of Keçikalesi stands. The next station, Caena, was probably in the region of Çukurkent or Uluören (below, p. 258), while Tracias is likely to have been at Kınıkörenleri, 6 km. S of Ortaköy, where the map marks both ruins and a mound. From here there is an uninterrupted run to Tyana (Kemerhisar or Kilisehisar). This section from Archelais to Tyana is given correctly, in principle, by Miller (Itineraria Romana, cols. 662 f.), working from Kiepert's map. As worked out on the Turkish map, the distances correspond to those of the Table, but the site at Kınıkörenleri requires investigation.

The Table marks no connexion from Tyana to Aquis Calidis, which it puts on a road from Ikonion to Tarsus (Section D). The distance from Tyana to Faustiniopolis is given by the Antonine Itinerary as 18 m.p., by the Jerusalem Itinerary as 12 m.p. and by a milestone near the site of Faustiniopolis (CIL iii, no. 12213) as 23 m.p. On the map, it appears to be nearer 26 m.p. Caena, which appears on the Table between [Archelais] and Tyana, is given by the Jerusalem Itinerary at the same point as the Aquis Calidis of the Table, and it has been argued that the Table is therefore wrong (HGAM, p. 360, Lycaonia col. 101). Since the existence of Aquae Calidae is vouched for by the so-called Cappadocian Itinerary (CIL vi, no. 5076), and since Caena does

not appear in the Antonine Itinerary, it is likely that the fault lies with the Jerusalem Itinerary rather than with the Table. It must surely be accepted that when a section of the Peutinger Table works out on the ground, with regard to the overall distance and when reasonably suitable intermediate stations can be found, that section is substantially correct. The section Archelais - Tyana fulfils that condition, whereas the distances given by the Jerusalem Itinerary between Tyana and Podandos are far too short.

Tracias is also objected to (HGAM, pp. 348, 449), but the arguments put forward are not conclusive. Dryzes and Tracias show no sign of being the same place. The Dratai of Ptolemy (V, 6, 17) may be the same as Tracias; it was in Tyanitis, and lay, according to Ptolemy's coordinates, half way between Tyana and Salambriai, the Salaberina of the Table.

Section D. This^{is} a combination of several of the roads given by the Table

- i) Amurio xx Laudiciaca Tacecaumeno.
- ii) Synnada xxxii Jullae xxxv Philomelo xxviii Laudiciaca Tacecaumeno xxiii Caballucome xxxii Sabatra.
- iii) Yconio - Aquis Calidis xii Paduando xx Fines Cilicie xxv In Monte Tauro xxx
- iv) Paduando xxii Coriopio xi In Monte xii

i) This road is given in a very truncated form, with no intermediate stations. The one distance, xx m.p., may well refer to the first stage from Amorion (Assar; p.146) to Aşagi Piribeyli

where there is a gap between Emir Dağ and the hills around Yunak, as well^{as} a large ancient site (p. 147). Once through the gap, the road would have had an easy passage, via Atlandı (Aralleia ? of MAMA i, no. 292), to join the Synnada - Savatra road at Laodikeia Katakekaumene. Another road, not given by the Table, from Pessinous to Philomelion and Antiocheia, is generally believed to have passed through the same gap (MAMA vii, p. xix).

D ii) The Table makes the total distance from Synnada (p. 112) to Philomelion (Akşehir) 67 m.p., as against 65 by the map (via Selevir, Çay and Ishakli). Julia (Jullae) should be a little to the west of the modern Çay (which is 34 m.p. from Synnada), rather than at Ishakli as proposed in JHS viii (1887, p. 490), where the total from Synnada to Philomelion is estimated at 59 m.p. and Social Basis (pp. 296 ff.) where it is estimated at 52 m.p.. Concrete evidence of the exact site has yet to be found, but the municipal inscriptions built into a bridge between Çay and Bolvadin (JRS ii, 1912, pp. 241 ff.) can probably be assigned to Julia, as Polybotos (Bolvadin) appears not to have been a city before the Byzantine period (CERP, p. 69; RE s.v. Polybotos). (but see Hellenica VII, p. 219)

Philomelion is always regarded as securely fixed at Akşehir (RE, s.v. Philomelion).

From Philomelion to Laodikeia by the modern direct road is about 60 m.p. as against the Table's 28 m.p.. Lageina, the modern Ilgın (MAMA vii, p. xvii f.), 31 m.p. from Philomelion and 29 from Laodikeia, has evidently been omitted.

At Laodikeia, now Ladik (MAMA i, pp. xiv f.), this road was joined by one from Amorion (Section D i).

From Laodikeia to Caballucome and Savatra, two routes were possible. The more direct, as well as the easier, is via Kinik, Göğenç and Tutup, and thence over Tutup Beli to Kulak Murat Hanı and across the open plain to Ak Bağ Beli, a very gentle pass over the S arm of Boz Dağ that leads almost directly to Savatra. The distance is about 52 miles. The second route, crossing the Bağrıkturt pass, SE of Laodikeia, drops into the plain of Ikonion at Dokuzun Hanı, where it turns east for Akbağ and Savatra, a total distance of about 55 m.p., as in the Table.

In a previous article, I provisionally located Caballucome at Kulak Murat Hanı, a large Roman site immediately S of Tutup Beli (AS viii, p. 231) where the road probably crossed Fakra Dağ, the western arm of Boz Dağ. This identification has been adopted on the map (pl. 44); Tutup, at the N end of the same pass, fits the distances better, being 23 m.p. from Laodikeia and 30 m.p. from Savatra. The mound at Tutup is however much less impressive in size than that at Kulak Murat Hanı, and the quality of the pottery is much lower (p. 189). The question of which of the two routes round Fakra Dağ was used would be resolved if Caballucome were at Tutup which lay on the northern route. But Kulak Murat Hanı could have been on either. On the whole, the northern route appears to be more probable simply because it ran through a populous area (p. 189) whereas the southern one did not. There is no milestone that could decide the question finally.

A milestone at Tutup bears the distance-figure $\eta\rho'$, which

corresponds well with the distance from Amorion, and equally well with that from Ahiboz (AS viii, p. 230, no.8; above, Section B, p. 165). Between Caballucome and Savatra there is a considerable number of milestones, some of which, such as a pair in a cemetery E of Kulak Murat Hani (AS loc.cit., nos. 2 and 3), help to confirm the line of the road. The majority, however, have obviously been carried, and have little topographical value.

Beyond Savatra, the modern Yalibayat (JHS xxii, 1902, pp. 367 ff., SERP, pp. 157 ff.) the Table fails us. It has always been assumed that the road continued via Gene (Kana), Karapınar (Hyde?) and Ereğli (Kybistra) to the Cilician Gates and beyond, but although this makes very good sense, no milestones are known to prove it. The road presumably approaches Kybistra through the gap in the marshes near Hortu used by the modern Konya - Ereğli chaussée. Beyond Ereğli it may well have taken the direct line to Faustiniopolis via Tont and Kilan, rather than the more roundabout route taken by the modern road. The site of Faustiniopolis is proved with reasonable certainty by the Itineraries, which put it 25 or 26 m.p. from Podandos (Pozanti) on a road to Tyana, and by a milestone (CIL iii, no. 12213) near Beyağıl, marked Faustinianae Col(oniae), apparently a locative, as well as ^{with} a distance from Tyana. The exact site was located by Ramsay at Zeyve (Lycaonia, col. III). (But see A.S. xiv, 1964, pp. 140 ff.)

D iii) The Table takes up its account again at Aquae Calidae 14 m.p. beyond Faustiniopolis at the modern Çiftahan Kaplıcası (Lycaonia, col. 110). From Aquae Calidae to Tarsus it appears to show two roads, one via the Cilician Gates, the other via

Coriopio, apparently further to the east. In addition to the stations and distances, an attempt is made to represent, both pictorially and by the legends in Monte and in monte Tauro, the mountain range through which these roads pass.

Miller (Itineraria Romana cols. 665 f., 692) has attempted to split the roads as far back as Kybistra, taking the western one over the main ridge of the Taurus to Namrum and the eastern one through the Gates. The Namrum route, as he admits, involves a pass over 3000 m. high, and this is unthinkable.

But the Table here requires a little emendation. The distance from Aquae Calidae to Paduando, the modern Pozanti (HGAM, pp. 348 f.) is reasonably correct, and it should be here that the road forked. The western route appears to be Paduando xx Fines Cilicie xxv in monte Tauro xxx [Tarso]. In fact the road is not connected up to Tarsus on the Table. The distances are far too great, 75 m.p. as against 40 on the map. As Fines Cilicie were presumably at the Gates, ^{where} a rock-cut inscription (CIL iii, no. 12118) marks the frontier, the distance from Paduando can be emended from xx to xv, corresponding to 14 m.p. by the Jerusalem Itinerary and ^{13 m.p. by} the modern road. But there is still an excess of 30 m.p., which can only be the xxx coming after in monte Tauro. The original form was probably fines Cilicie xxv (in monte Tauro) Tarso xxx, the words in monte Tauro being merely descriptive. Tauro and Tarso look very much alike, and the copyist probably omitted Tarso to avoid what looked, at first sight, like a dittography. The distance xxx remains unexplained, but may belong to one of the other roads radiating from Tarsus.

D iv) Below Pozanti, the modern road swings away from the Porsuk Çay, which it has followed from near Ulukışla, into a valley leading to the Gates. The railway, on the other hand, continues to follow the river, through a gorge quite as impressive as that of the Gates. This gorge may be the one taken by the eastern route of the Table, Paduando xxii Coriopio xi in monte xii [Tarso]. Here again the words in monte are probably descriptive, but have suppressed the name of a station; the missing station should be Mopsucrene (sic CIL vi, no. 5076), 12 miles from Tarsus by the Jerusalem Itinerary (which has Mansucrinae).

Coriopio, 23 m.p. from Tarsus and 22 from Podandos, should be near Bucak Railway Station. While it is possible that Coriopio represents Koropissos in Ketis, badly misplaced (HGAM, pp. 358, 263), the exactness with which the distances fit the route makes this unlikely. To anticipate criticism, I should add that I have never seen this route except from the windows of a train, which spent much of its time in tunnels. The map does not mark a continuous waggon-track along it.

Section E. Antiochia Pisidia - [Pappa] - [Lystra] - [Laranda] ad Fines xvi Tetrapyrgia xviii Pompeiopolis xx Soloe.

This route is a combination of the eastern part of the Via Sebaste, Antiocheia - ? Lystra, which is partly shown by the Table, of a road Lystra-Laranda, which is not shown, and of a road Laranda - ?Seleukeia, shown as from Ikonion to Soloi.

From Antiocheia to Pappa the line of the Via Sebaste is well marked by milestones (JHS xxii, 1902, pp. 109 f.). From

Pappa (Yunuslar) to the ancient site at Kizilören the course of the road is defined by a narrow river valley, the Bağırsak Dere. At Kizilören the road split, one portion going to Ikonion by roughly the same line as the modern and Seljuk roads (pp.18ff). Another branch probably struck across the mountains to Lystra (SERP, pp. 241 ff.), and this, rather than the road to Ikonion, was the Via Sebaste proper. Beyond Lystra there was a road, probably that used by Cyrus (p. 158) along the SE side of the Lykaonian plain to Laranda (Karaman; p. 246). Milestones of this road (or of the road from Ikonion to Isaura, Section B) have been found at Kavak (CIL iii, no. 12215) and in a bridge over the Çargamba, apparently at Dineksaray (CIL iii, no. 12218).

Beyond Laranda the road is shown by the Table as running to Soloe (i.e. Pompeiopolis). But the Table is very confused at that point, marking Soloe once and Pompeiopolis twice. On general grounds it is much more likely that the road was intended to run either to Seleukeia, via Klaudiopolis, or to Korykos, via Olba.

Ad Fines would presumably be on the watershed 15 or 20 m.p. from Laranda.

Tetrapyrgia could be anywhere.

Section F. Yconio l Barata xxxix Tyana xxvii Addavalis xv Scolla xxii Cibistra ix Tetra - Mazaca Cesarea.

This road also is incomplete, owing to the omission of the stations between Barata and Tyana. It appears at first sight to have run straight across the plain to Tyana, probably via Karapınar (Hyde?; p. 230), but this view necessitates the finding of a suitable site for Barata either 50 m.p. E of Ikonion or

39 m.p. W of Tyana. On the whole Ramsay's view that Barata lay at Maden Şehir under the N end of Kara Dağ (p. 242), although by no means conclusive, seems more likely, especially as Madenşehir fits the Table's position for Barata well; putting Barata at Madenşehir, the rest of the road becomes clear. It ran straight across the plain to Sidamaria (Anbar; p. 232), squeezed itself between the hills and the marshes to Kybistra (Ereğli; RE Supp. iv, col. 1123) and struck NW across the plain to Tyana. The distance from Kybistra to Tyana, 41 m.p., is near enough to the 39 m.p. given by the Table for the stretch Barata - Tyana. Strabo's distance of 300 stades from Kybistra to Tyana (539) confirms the existence of the road, which is in any case an obvious natural line with no difficulties.

Beyond Tyana the Table's distance to Andabalis should be emended from xxvii to xvii (It. Ant. has xvi, It. Hier., xviii, while the actual distance from Tyana to the ruins at Eski Andaval is 18 m.p.). Ramsay dismissed both Scolla and Cibistra as hopelessly corrupt (HGAM, p. 306) but later decided (Lykaonia, col. 128) that Zengibar Kalesi above Yeşilhisar was the Kyzistra of Ptolemy (V, 6, 14). In the Table, b and z are almost identical in form and it is not surprising that the copyist should have confused Kyzistra with the better-known Kybistra. The distance from Andabalis, 37 m.p. fits almost exactly, and Yeşilhisar (Develikarahisar) is practically the only spot in this plain fertile enough to support a large settlement. Scolla may therefore be reprieved and located provisionally in the area of Hüyük Han, 15 m.p. from Andabalis and 21 from Yeşilhisar. Tetra may have been in the region of Yavaş Hanı about 8 m.p. beyond Yeşilhisar.

Section G. This route is compounded of the Table's road Yconio xx Pyrgos xxiii Sabatra and of a road Savatra - Koropassos - Archelais inferred from Strabo.

From Ikonion to Savatra the total distance given by the Table is correct, and it is therefore probable that the intermediate station Pyrgos is not misplaced, although no suitable site for it can be suggested (AS, viii, p. 232). Koropassos was almost certainly at Ak Han (pp. 226 f.), which accords well with Strabo's distance of 120 stades from Garsaoura (i.e. Archelais; RE s.v. Archelais, 2), reckoning 7.5 stades to the Roman mile, as in the distance from Kybistra to Tyana (Section E). The connexion from Archelais to Kouamitanassos (or Ubinnaca) and Savatra is inferred from general probabilities and from the fact that Strabo in his account of this area mentions only Garsaoura, Koropassos and Savatra, as if his informant had passed along a road connecting all three.

Section H. Yconio - Junction with road from Antiocheia lxxx Sidi.

The first stage of this route, between Ikonion and Pappa, has already been described (Section E). At or not far beyond Pappa the Side road branched off to the left calling at Mistea (Beyşehir; AS, ix, 1959, pp. 119 ff.). Beyond Mistea, the modern road, via Akseki, is neither the straightest nor the flattest line. A more direct and natural route, to judge solely by the map, is via Üskeles, Çetmi, Derebucak, Çukurören, Başlar, Eynif Hanı, Beldibi Hanı, down the Ücirmak just to the west of Sirt (Lanckoronski's site for Pednelissos), and finally down

the Naras Çay. The northern part of this route, as far as Çukurören, was covered by Jüthner's expedition (Denkmäler, pp. 47 ff.). At least five Turkish hans are marked on various maps, but the road to which they belonged seems to have turned westwards from a point N of Sirt and continued down the valley of the Kargı Çay. Ramsay (ABSA ix, 1902-3, p. 261) was told of a route over the Taurus via Ibradi that was suitable for waggons, though Anderson (ibid.) maintained the contrary. The road proposed here keeps to the west of Ibradi, avoiding the rough country between Ibradi and Sirt. The total distance is about 87 m.p. from Mistea to Side, as opposed to 114 m.p. by the modern road via Akseki.

Section I. A road from Mistea to Isaura, not given by the Table, is established beyond doubt by a series of milestones scattered along the Seydişehir valley (WE pp. 179, 182, 186 f.; Denkmäler, pp. 38 ff.; JRS xiv, 1924, p. 76, no. 110). There are also signs of a road along the shore of the lake NNW of Mistea (JHS, xxii, 1902, pp. 109 f.).

Section J. The existence of a road from Laranda to Kybistra can be assumed on grounds of probability, even though there is no direct literary or epigraphic evidence for it. It would have run via Derbe and joined the Savatra - Kybistra road at Sidamaria (p. 232) or possibly, following the same line as the modern railway, at Büyecik a few miles further east.

Section K. The Pamphylian - Cilician coast-road is

mentioned here only in passing, though estimated distances are marked on the map (pl. 44). The correct location of the stations is not guaranteed.

LYKAONIA

Ikonion and the Ikonian Plain

At Ikonion (Konya), there are now virtually no remains of antiquity outside the well arranged and excellently documented museum. The church of St. Amphilochius (1001 Churches, pp. 403f.) has been destroyed, and nothing except the sherds on the enormous mound known as Ala'cttin Tapesi now indicates the site of a city which, from pre-classical times on, was the richest and most influential in the Lykaonian plain. This is largely explained by its great prosperity under the Seljuk Sultans; a wave of building activity in the last ten years has done far more to hide the earlier remains than to reveal them.

The ancient road-system radiating from Ikonion has been overlaid, rather than accentuated, by the Seljuk net-work, but there is no reason to disbelieve the general accuracy of the roads given by the Peutinger Table (above).

Sille. The town of Sille, 9 km. NW of Ikonion, now has only a fraction of the population that it had forty years ago, when it was inhabited largely by Greeks. The church of St. Michael (RA, Ser. IV, ix, Jan.-June 1907, pp. 20 ff.), is still standing. In its present form it is certainly very late, as carved slabs, unlikely to be earlier than the 10th century, are reused in the walls. A pair of small churches, leading out of one another (pl. 28) are cut in the rock above the right bank of the stream a little further to the east. Both are irregular in plan and very irregular in roofing. That on the

west has some remains of painting, including a number of standing figures of saints on the arches of the roof*, and a Koimesis over the door (pl.P9,C). All the colours have faded very badly, except the blue ground-colour, which has darkened almost to black. The floor is honey-combed with burials.

Takalı Dağ. The road running westwards from Ikonion was protected by a castle on the summit of Takalı Dağ, better known as the Hill of St. Philip, a steep conical peak about 8 km. WNW of the city.

The only recognizable attempt at scientific fortification is a round tower, some 10 m. in diameter, on the SW, which was the only approachable side (pl.P8,C). It is built of small, roughly shaped, blocks, with a core of rubble and good mortar. The remainder of the circuit takes advantage of natural cliffs, and appears to be of two periods, one contemporary with the tower, the other apparently older. To this older phase belong two patches of wall (pl.P8,D) built of rough polygonal lumps of trachyte, up to 1 m. long, with a little mortar, which suggests that the original castle was probably Byzantine work, put up in a hurry, rather than earlier, as Hamilton deduced from the polygonal stones and, at first sight, absence of mortar. On the summit there are traces of what may have been a chapel. Several cisterns are preserved, two of them with vaulting of pitched bricks at the end and radiating bricks near the centre.

The castle appears to be substantially of Byzantine date, though it may also have been occupied in Seljuk times.

The ancient road may have passed along the foot of Takalı Dağ, keeping to the N edge of the valley that provides the natural route westwards from Ikonion, whereas the Seljuk road

* Pl.P9,B, showing the N aisle.

Pl.P9,A, shows the SE corner of the E church.

followed by the modern chaussée, ran along the south edge. The two lines meet near Degirmen Köyü, where Mr. Hall and I found a milestone of Nerva in 1957. From here one road must have gone on to Kizilören^{and} Yunuslar (Pappa-Tiberiopolis), while another (HGAM pp. 359 f.; MAMA vii, p. xviii) probably struck NW across the mountains to Çiğil and Akşehir (Philomelion).

The Plain of Ikonion. Going north along the road from Ikonion to Laodikeia Katakekaumene, the traveller has a continuous range of mountains on his left and a flat and dreary expanse of plain on his right. Dotted about this plain were a number of ancient villages, of which that at Kulak Murat (Hacı Murat) Hanı was probably the largest; it has been tentatively identified with the Çaballucome of the Peutinger Table (p. 171), and is probably the source of several inscriptions found nearby at Eğribayat, which will be published in MAMA viii (nos. 325 ff.). The site is about 400 m. in diameter, and is grouped round a substantial mound. The pottery is mainly Hellenistic and Roman, and numerous Roman Milestones have been recorded there at various times (see the offprint from AS viii in the folder of plates, p. 230).

Two other old hans further south, Zencirli Han and Zazaddin (Sadettin) Hanı*, also appear to be ancient sites, and the former may be the Salarama of no. 167. There are said to be foundations of a church on Kınık Tepe, NE of Divankar, and there are certainly remains of a small settlement, with Hellenistic pottery and a very rough relief of a horseman, at the foot of the hill. The village of Acidört stands on an ancient site and Sütçe Hk, E of Zivecik, is said to be the source of some ancient

* Pl. P9, D.

stones. But the plain was on the whole a poor area. Only on the western edge, where streams run into the plain at Meram and Sille, does it preserve any sign of greenness in summer.

The Ikonian Plain

Inscriptions

165. DIVANLIAR, in the porch of a house. Greyish-white limestone column with flat panel projecting from one side, buried below. H. 142 plus, diam. 38 (panel 90 x 45), lett. 3.0 - 3.5. Above the panel, wreath of leaves and fruit. Pl. 27 .

- [I]mp Caesar L. Se
 [pt]imius Severu[s]
 [p]ius pertinax Au[g.]
 [A]rabicus Adiabe
 5. [ni]cus Parthicus
 [m]aximus pon[t]
 [i]fex maxim[us]
 trib. potest[ati-]
 [s] v[i imp. xi [cons]
 10. [ul] ii p(ater) p(at)r(iae) p[rocos]
 [et] Imp. Ca[esar]
 [M]arcus Au[rel]
 [ius] Antonin[us]
 [Au]g. cos. Par[thi-]
 15. [cus] [m]aximus [res-]
 [tit]uerunt p[er]
 [C.] A[t]ticium S[tr-]
 [ep]onem legatu[m]
 Augg. pr(o) pr(aetore) m.
 20. passus vac

11. 9-10 The restoration given here follows SERP, p. 172, no. 56. But see no. 137.

Date A.D. 198 (or 202/3 ?)

166. GÜCÜ, in a house. Upper part of altar, in blue-flecked white marble, broken below and behind. H. 12 plus, w. 22, th. 9 plus, lett. 1.2 - 1.7, Pl. 27.

[---] βηνῶ εὖ-
[X] ἦν [ο] δεινὰ
κ(ε?) Λουκίου.

1.1. Λα.ρ βηνῶ?

167. ZINCIRLI, in the right-hand side of the door of the han. Creamy-white limestone bomos, concealed below. H. 72, w. 44, 41, -, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. On the shaft, defaced relief. Pl. 27

Παυλεῖνδ Παυ-
λεῖνδ Θυγατήρ
Δί(ι) Σα defaced λαρδ-
μεῖ relief εὖχην.

Published JHS xxii, 1902, p. 368, no. 141.

168. TÖMEK, in the steps of the school. Bluish marble slab or defaced stele, probably buried on all sides. H. 85 plus, w. 60 plus, th. -, lett. 2 - 3. Pl. 28.

[Αὐρή]λιος Μενέδεη-
μος καὶ Αὐρηλία Π-
ρεῖς καὶ Αὐρηλί(ος) Με-

- νέδημος ἀνέστ-
 5. ἦσαν Αἰλίδ Ινλ-
 λία μυη[μ]ης Χά-
 ριν.

There are faint traces of an earlier inscription, of which only the letters Χάριν below the end of 1.6 can be deciphered. The sigma in line 5 is engraved over a partly erased omikron or theta, and some of the confusion at the end of 1.5 is due to the presence of partly erased letters.

169. KARAKAYA, in a stable. Grey marble column, broken below, buried above. H. 90 plus, diam. 33, lett. 2 - 3. Above the inscription, Latin cross in relief. Pl. 28

το καλλή κατέχῃ | μνήμα Τριῶ φίλ | τὰ πᾶσι
 βροτοῖσιν || Ἀστέριον πινυτήν ⁽⁵⁾ Θ(ΕΟ)ῦ σεμνον ἱερῶ ||
 συν τ' ἄλλοισιν | κλυτοῖς Σατορνινῶ | κδοιγνιτῶ ||
 καὶ | Πέτρῳ πινυτῇ ⁽¹⁰⁾ ἀνεψίῳ νεῶ ἔρνι ||

170. Between GÜÇÜ and SAKYATAN, at a well. Grey limestone stele with pediment and recessed panel, broken above. H. 105, w. -, 59, 72, th. -, panel 48 x 34, lett. 3 - 4. Pl. 28

- ἐν Χριστῷ Εἰσι-
 οῦ. πρεσβιτέρῳ
 zeus² ἀδελ-
 φὸς αὐτοῦ ἀνεσ-
 5. τησεν ἰσότητην
 μετὰ τῶν γαμ(Β)ρ-
 ῶν αὐτοῦ μνήμ-
 ης χάριν. εὐκο-
 υ εἶπερ ἡμῶν.

171. ZIVECIK, in front of a house. Grey limestone stele with moulded panel. H. 133, w. 37, th. 20, panel 120 x 32, lett.

2.5 - 4.0. Pl. 29

ένθ' αὐτὰ κα-

τάκιτε ἀνὴρ

εὐλαβὴς κα

πιστεὸς ἀξίος

5. Ζωτικ[ῆς] πρεσ (βύτερος)

Ἀποτα[κ]τιτῆς

νεῖος Λουκίου

ἀνεστησεν ἡ

ἐξιδελφῆ

10. μου Ἀρμὶα τὴν

εἰστήλῃν ταυ-

τὴν ζωσά

μνήμης Χά-

ριν cross.

1.6 Cf. MAMA i, no. 173, Calder in Studies.... Ramsay, pp. 84 ff., MAMA vii, no. 88.

172. ZIVECIK, in a yard. White limestone stele with steep pediment. H. 80, w. 29, 25, 35, th. 16, lett. 2 - 4. On the shaft, a cross. Pl. 29.

[-] ω [- -] η ρ

cross.
 | δ ξ ι ο ς | ε σ θ ' δ θ α | ν ω ν ᾱ (s) γ α θ η ς | μ υ η μ η ς | Ἀ ρ ε σ τ ι | δ η ς ||
 γ η ρ α | λ ε ο ς vac.

LYKAONIA

Fakra Dag.

The northern boundary of the plain of Ikonion is formed by a narrow range of hills running out from the mountains between Zizima and Laodikeia in an easterly direction, to join Boz Dag between Eğribayat and Mernek. Strictly speaking, it should be called Fakra Dag, but it forms very much a part of Boz Dag. The ancient road from Ikonion to Laodikeia must have crossed it where the modern *chaussée* does, at Bağlıkurt, while a second road, running E from Laodikeia to Savatra, passed along either its N or S side (p. 171). The country immediately S of the hills is bare and inhospitable, and has never proved of any archaeological interest. On the N, however, there is a row of three large classical and pre-classical sites, Fetin HK., Tatlikuyu HK. and Tutup. All are of Bronze Age to Roman date, with very little sign of Byzantine occupation. Tatlikuyu HK. is the largest (about 300 by 200 m. and 15 m. high) and appears from its pottery to have been the most prosperous. Gökçe HK, 4 km. further N, half way between Göğenç and Camili, is a miserably poor Iron Age and Roman site.

At Takalı Kuyu, 5 km. NE of Tutup, there is a small and poor Byzantine site, possibly a monastery, with remains of several isolated buildings and a few carved lintels. Apart from Eğribayat on the S side of the hills, which is here treated as part of the Ikonian plain (p. 182), the district is very poor in inscriptions.

LYKAONIA
The Northern Boz Dağ

The northern arm of Boz Dağ, unlike the central and southern sections, is low and easily crossed at most points. From the pass between Mernek and Sarnıç, which cuts it off from the central Boz Dağ and from Fakra Dağ, it runs NNE for about 25 km. before losing itself in the plain, where its line is continued by the outlying peak Kara Dağ, not to be confused with many others of the same name.

The modern villages, many of which were also ancient settlements, are scattered along its skirts wherever water is obtainable near the surface, and are in general both fairly prosperous and extremely hospitable. Both the hills and the surrounding plain are almost bare of vegetation in summer, and one can spend days travelling from village to village without seeing a tree.

Zívarık, now a nahiye and for a long time the most important village in the district, appears to be the ancient Kongoustos, the Congusso of the Peutinger Table (p.163). A high mound that stands near the centre of the modern village is covered with Iron Age ^{and Hellenistic} pottery, but it appears that the ~~Hellenistic and~~ later settlement lies under the modern one. Not only is it unlikely that a well-watered site such as this should have been abandoned in Hellenistic ^{and early Roman} times, when the population of the district as a whole seems to have been increasing fast, but some at least of the ancient stones there are said to have been found locally (e.g. no.186).

Behind Zívarík, at the top of the low pass leading to Zengicek, is the small Byzantine fort of Zengicek Kale (pls. 30, P9,E). The fort itself consists only of a small rocky hillock surrounded by a wall of rough stones and mortar, parts of which, including a tiny tower at the NW angle*, are preserved to a height of 7 m. At the corners and in the tower, the wall is reinforced with large tree-trunks (cf. the gate at Sozopolis, p. 133). The foundations project 45 cm. beyond the wall.

On the weakest side, the north, where the ground is level for some distance from the fort, there are signs of a low bank, originally no doubt accompanied by a ditch and palisade.

To SE of the fort, a small hollow is occupied by the remains of a fairly extensive settlement, among which a few poorly decorated Byzantine door-lintels can be distinguished. The pottery is Byzantine, and includes a high proportion of glazed ware unlikely to be earlier than the 11th century, as well as fragments of "Late Roman" plates that can hardly be later than the 7th⁽¹⁾.

The site is not a very desirable one even from the point of view of defence, and the main purpose of the fort must have been to hold the road across the pass. It does not give the impression of having ever been a city, and the location of Verinopolis there, with Psebila at Zívarík (SERP, p. 249), is unconvincing⁽²⁾.

Along the west side of the hills there are few if any ancient sites apart from that at Zívarík and a miserably poor mound near Sarnıç. At Toprakkale, to the N of Boz Dağ, however, there are remains of an extensive site on and around a mound, probably

* Pl. P9,F.

partly natural, which reaches a height of 20 m. at one end. At the top of the mound there are slight remains of a defensive wall with a circuit of over 400 m., but the whole site, including the skirt of the mound, must be at least 600 m. in diameter. The pottery includes much Iron Age, good Hellenistic and Roman and some Byzantine, including late glazed wares. The ancient name of Toprakkale was probably Senzousa⁽³⁾.

Kara Dağ, even further to the N, is an isolated hill rising very steeply some 100 m. out of the plain; there are said to be remains of a castle, with a wall of mortared stones on the SE and traces of house-walls inside.

On the E side of the Northern Boz Dağ, Akçasar and Zengicek are both ancient sites, and the former has a castle of sorts, which I have seen only at a distance.

Northern Boz Dağ

NOTES

(1) "Late Roman red" pottery occurs at Antioch up to the mid-seventh century (Antioch IV, i, pp. 57 f.); at Emporio on Chios it was still in use at the time of the destruction of the

Byzantine citadel, about 670. The introduction of glazed wares, and in particular of sgraffiato earthenware, which is practically the only form of Byzantine glazed pottery commonly found in Central Asia Minor, is a more difficult problem; at Constantinople it has been dated about the middle of the 11th century (D. Talbot Rice, Byzantine Glazed Pottery, Oxford 1930, p. 33), but at Seleukeia on the Orontes, A. Lane (Archaeologia lxxxviii, 1937, pp. 34 f.) suggests a ninth to tenth-century date for what appears to be a similar ware. But its presence in quantity on a site such as Zengicek Kale is not likely to go back much before the Turkish invasions.

(2) The whole question of the sites of Verinopolis and Psebila, which are known only from the Notitiae, hangs on a resemblance of name between Psebila and the Pegella of the Peutinger Table, (HGAM, pp. 344 f.; Lycaonia, col. 94; JHS xix, 1899, p. 131; RE, s.v. Pegella). Pegella (p. 163) is unlikely to have been as far east as Boz Dağ, and while Ramsay's location of Psebila and Verinopolis is attractive, (because a bishopric is required in the N Boz Dağ) it is based on no real evidence at all.

(3) MAMA i, p. xvi (viii, no. 296), a boundary stone of Anzoulada

and Senzousa, half way between Akören (p.226) and Toprak Kale;
Anderson (JHS xix, 1899, p. 134) gives a more detailed
description of Toprak Kale, when the site was better preserved.

Northern Boz DagInscriptions

173. ZIVARIK, in a house. Greyish-white marble bomos, broken below. H. 33, w. 26, 20, -, th. 22, 17, -, lett. 2.0 - 2.5. On the shaft, defaced relief. Pl. P10.

Ἀμμὶς Σενζούσ-
[γν]ή εὐχήν.

Apparently a dedication to a mother-goddess of Senzousa (above, p. 192).

174. ZENGICEK, in a house. Grey marble bomos. H. 68, w. 24, 22, 27, th. 19, 15, 20, lett. 1.5. On the shaft, vine with grapes in relief. Pl. 29

? [A'] λ(105) Σωσθένης
[Δ]ιονύσω εὐχήν.

175. AKÇAŞAR, in the wall of a house. Grey marble bomos, broken below. H. 46 plus, w. 25, 22, -, th. 20, -, -, lett. 2 - 3. A small basin, with lip, hollowed out of the upper surface. Pl. 29.

Μ. Αἴλιος

Μέντρι-

ος ὁ τοῦ

Μακροῦ

5. Ἀνυσίος [τ-]

εὐ εὐχήν.

176. AKCASAR, in a yard. Grey marble slab, probably part of a sarcophagus, with tabula ansata; broken on all sides. H. 52 plus, w. 60 plus, th. 17, lett. 2.7 - 3.4. Pl. 29.

[- - -] νεος καὶ Μεστρίδ
 [Μεσο] κλεινὰ Ἀριδὺν
 [Θυγ]άτρι γλυκυτάτῃ
 [μνή]μης χάριν
 5. [ὁ δ]ὲ τοῖος Εἰδονοῦρικ
 τῇ δ]ελφῇ μου μόνον.

177. TEKIR, in the steps of a house. Coarse greyish white marble block. H. 98, w. 63, th. 25, lett. 4. Pl. 29.

Ἀνρ. Ἀππίδ
 Πάπιδι ἀνδρ¹
 καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρ[ω]
 ὡ γλυκυτάτῃ[ς]
 5. μνήμης χάριν.

1.5 The middle of the line is partly concealed by a post.

178. ZIVARIK, in the wall of a house. Pedimental stele of greyish-white marble, with lateral pilasters, broken above and below. H. 63 plus, w. 58, 53, -, th. -, letters 3. In the panel between the pilasters, female figure in relief within aedicula. Pl. 29.

Τὰτα Πρεῖουει Θυγ-
 τρι μνήμης χάριν.

179. ZENGICEK, in the wall of a house. Grey marble fragment, probably from a sarcophagus, with tabula ansata; broken all sides. H. 42 plus, w. 72 plus, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. Pl. 29.

Πονπώνιος leaf Μέστριος
ναε. Εὐκάρπος ἔπεσκεύασεν
 τὴν σοφὸν καὶ τ-
 ὄν περίβολον
 5. [σ]ὺν τῇ συνβείῳ
 [.....] μνήμης
 [χάριν]

1.2 The last three letters could not be photographed, but the copy is clear.

180. ZENGICEK, in a lane. Grey marble column, cut off above, probably complete below. H. 145 plus, diam. 34, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. Pl. 29.

[-----]
 στήλῃν εὐποίη-
 τον ἀνδοτήσας
 ἐχάρξεν // ναε.
 5. ὁφρὶ πολυκλῆυσ-
 τοιο τάφου μνη-
 μηῖος εἴη // ναε.

181. ZENGICEK, in the wall of a yard; upper part of stele, with pediment and acroteria; in the pediment a boss; broken above

and below. H. 38 plus, w. 55, th. -, lett. 3.5 - 4.5. Pl. 30

Μαίω Μάρκου Δορυ-
μένει ἀνδρὶ σεμν[ο]
[τάτω μνήμης]
[Χάριν]

182. ZENGICEK, in the wall of a house. Grey marble bomos, with shallow sunk panel; broken right and behind. H. 67, w. 55 plus, th. 30 plus, lett. 3 - 4. Pl. 30,

leaf. Μιθ[ρὰ δαίτης] ὧν καὶ
φρονῶ[ν] Ἀππᾶ καὶ Πρεῖου
γονευσ[ι] - - - - -
ης γενν[ι] - - - - -

5. νυν δὲ[ν] - - - - -
ἀποδω[σκει] τῷ Φισκῷ * &
Restored exempli gratia.

183. ZIVARIK, in the wall of a house. Coarse grey marble block, broken right. H. 87, w. 111 plus, th. 54, lett. 3.2 - 4.0.

Inscription in tabula ansata; on left, rosette in lozenge. Pl. 30.

Αὐρ. Αλεξάνδρ[ος] [δὲ] τοῦ Σεῖνος]
ἐλπίσας ἐπ[ὶ] [- - - - -]
τὰ ἵονος Χάρ[α] [- - - - -] ὧν κ[αὶ]
δι φρονῶν κ[αὶ] τεσσ[α]ρεσσ[α]ν ἐ[κ]

5. αὐτῷ κοιμητή[ριον]
μνήμης Χάρ[α] [- - - - -]

184. ZENGICEK, in the foundation of a house. Mottled grey and

white marble stele, with sunk panel, said to have been brought from the Kale; cut off above. H. 67 plus, w. 39, th. 22, lett.

2.7 - 3.0. Pl. 30.

[-----]

παρθενω

μνήμης Χά-

ριν leaf ρίψον

5. Σάπυ ω πα-

ροδία leaf

leaf leaf

185. MAYDUS, in the wall of the cemetery. Grey marble slab, part of a sarcophagus, with inscription in tabula ansata; broken left, right and below. H. 48 plus (panel 27), w. 45 plus, th. 14, lett. 1.7 - 2.2. On the upper border, constantinianum.

Pl. 31

[Μένε]ν Σπος Ἀσιδτι-

[κου δι]άκων ἰδία μη-

[τρί γλυ]κυτάτη τάτα

[καὶ γν]ησίω ἀδελφῶ

5. [Ἀριστ]ίωνι ἀγαθῶ ἐ-

[χέφρ]ονι φοβουμέ-

[νω ἀγ]νω παρθενω

[κρατ]ερω ἀθλητῇ

[? Θεου] ἀνέστησεν

10. [μνημ]όσυνου ἐνε-

10. [κεν τ]υμβῶ τω τ' ἐχά

vac ράξα

Restorations exempli gratia

186. ZIVARIK, in a house; dug up nearby the previous day.
Coarse marble slab, broken below. H. 36 plus, w. 37, th. 10,
lett. 1.3 - 2.1. In the lower left corner, incised Latin cross;
in the lower right corner, cross under semicircular ciborium(?),
roughly chipped at a later date. ll. 2-6 have rule^d guide-lines.
Pl. 31.

Δεντίλλης τοδε σῆμα κασιγνητης Πολυ/καρπιου ||
καλλος έχου/ς ἐρατινον και φρεν/ς ἡλικιαν τε ||
ἡδυλογου/κουρης ἐτεσσει π[έν]τε / και δεκα μου/νων ||

187. ZENGICEK, in a yard wall. Coarse grey marble block. H. 59,
w. 40, th. -, lett. 3 - 5. Pl. 31.

cross μινήμη
Ηωάν-
ο vac.

ll. 2-3 Presumably for Ἰωάννου.

188. HOYDUS, in the steps of a house. Rough slab of grey marble,
broken on all sides. H. 44 plus, w. 27 plus, th. -, lett. 1.7 -
4.0, with ruled guide-lines. Pl. 31.

cross
[κ(υρ)]ε βοήθε.
[Α]φθονις
Ἀλεξάνδρου
ἐνταδε Χιτε
cross

1.2 Perhaps Ἀφθονιο[ς]

LYKAONIA

Perta and Central Boz Dağ

From the neighbourhood of Mernek the central section of Boz Dağ runs in an easterly direction for about 20 km., forming a bold massif rising some 500 m. out of the plain. The S end of this massif is marked by the pass of Ak Bağ, which provides a very easy crossing from the plain N of Ikonion to the main Lykaonian plain. At its NW corner lay Perta, the modern Giymir, which was the largest settlement in the area, ranking as a city at least from the early 2nd century A.D., if the dedications to Trajan and (?) Hadrian (nos. 189 f.) are, as would seem likely, municipal. There is now no doubt that the site of Perta was at Giymir rather than at any of the neighbouring villages, though its inscriptions are scattered widely, some having been found as far off as Obruk, 12 km. E of Giymir, where they were used to build the Seljuk han⁽¹⁾. A roughly circular mound, about 8 m. high and 100 m. in diameter, stands on the outskirts of the modern village, and there are signs of ancient occupation over a much wider area, including a large building with marble columns about 100 m. N of the mound, which was being robbed out in 1956. The mound itself was fortified, presumably during the early Byzantine period, with a wall and probably a ditch. The pottery on the site is mainly Roman, with some Iron Age and Byzantine.

Mernek, on the S edge of the valley dividing the N and central sections of Boz Dağ, was a thriving village in antiquity; in

1956 there were still signs of a church (pp.204f), at the upper end of the modern village, and of a castle on a knoll a short way further to the S. The castle is roughly oval in plan, about 90 m. by 50 m., with walls of large rubble 2.30 m. thick. In spite of its very ruined state, it is possible to make out semicircular towers at some points, which may, like those of the Hendek in the plain of Sebaste (pp.16f), have had no back walls. There are also faint traces of a small ditch immediately outside the walls. The pottery is late Roman or early Byzantine, which suits the style of fortification well.

At Zulmandan'ın (Zulmandar) Hanı, in the same valley, about 6 km. ENE of Mernek, there is a large occupation site, which appears from its pottery to be late Byzantine and early Turkish, mainly the latter. As such, it is hardly likely to be the Zemrouta implied by a dedication to Zeus Zemroutenos said to have been brought from there to Akören (JHS xix, 1899, p. 281, no. 165). Zemrouta is more likely to have been at Zengicek (p. 192) or Mernek.

Obruk. The road given by the Peutinger Table (p.163) crossed the plain, probably from Zengicek, to touch at Perta, and then set off due E in the direction of Hasan Dağı. 12 km. beyond Perta lies Obruk, which is principally remarkable for a large Seljuk han, a collection of Roman milestones in the cemetery, and a curious lake, locally known as the Sea of Obruk, in a circular depression perhaps 50 m. deep, with very steep sides. The water is said to be undrinkable, but the banks provide good pasture in a dry summer. Obruk certainly lay on the line of the Roman road, and may have been an ancient

settlement, but any remains of this are obscured by the once large Turkish village, which has now dwindled to a few houses.

One further site in the area is worth a fairly lengthy description, as it does appear to have been visited before.

Ballık Ören. A small Byzantine settlement, possibly a monastery, stood on the E edge of the flat summit of Ballık Dağ, 5 km. SW of Perta.

The only remains are the church, which appears to have stood by itself, and a huddle of smaller buildings about 70 m. further west.

Plan. The church is almost completely ruined, but parts of the plan can still be made out (pl. 32). While many of the details are doubtful, the main lines are sufficiently certain to show that the roof probably consisted of a dome over the central area, semidomes over the minute apse and the N and S exhedrae, and barrel-vaults elsewhere. The scheme appears to be a later modification of that used in St. George at Ortaköy in Cappadocia (Kleinas. Denkm., fig. 48), where however the apse is much larger and there is no narthex.

Construction. The walls were built of small, very rough, blocks of local grey limestone, set in a weak whitish mortar (Pl. Pl. C, A). No mouldings were to be seen in situ, but the architectural members lying in the ruins included a piece of very rough white limestone double-column, (67 x 30 cm. in plan), a fragment of white marble octagonal column (diameter 22 cm.), a scrap of pre-Byzantine white marble architrave, and a door-jamb which appears to have belonged to the W door (Pl. 23/32)

It is said that columns and traces of wall-painting were

formerly visible.

Nearby lies a fine slab decorated with crosses (pl.P10B).

Date. In the present state of our knowledge, the only indication of date is the very poor construction, which may indicate a very late date though there are reasons for thinking that the standard of construction in Boz Dag was probably lower than elsewhere simply because of the lack of good stone. The plan is obviously derived from early origins; a series of fifth and sixth century churches in Lycia briefly published by R.M. Harrison (ILN, 20/8/1960), as well as Maden Şehir no.9 (1001 Churches pp. 79 f.) have a true triconch plan in which all three apses open directly off the domed space. St. George at Ortaköy is perhaps of the sixth century, while the tiny rock-cut church near Kızıllören (Denkmäler pp. 106 ff., Kleinasien pp. 147 f.), in which a barrel-vaulted chancel separates the east apse from the dome-space, is not likely to be very much later. The church on Ballik Dağı[✓] seems to come at the end of this series, though it can hardly be later than the Turkish conquest, and is^{certainly} far earlier than the introduction of the three-apsed plan into the Balkans, where it became very common in the 14th and later centuries⁽²⁾. The mouldings of the lintel are very similar to the "concave moulding" used at Madenşehir and Değile, "especially on the late churches at Madenşehir" (1001 Churches, p. 479), but it gives no positive indication of date.

Other Churches in Boz Dag. At the upper end of the village of Mernek (above, p. 202), a sizeable church was being robbed out in the autumn of 1956. The plan (pl.31) was recoverable in its main lines from the robber-trenches, though most of the

walls had been removed. The walls were of small, roughly dressed blocks and whitish mortar. One of the rectangular piers,^a plain monolith of coarse bluish marble, 65 x 23 cm. in plan, was apparently in situ. The church must have been a basilica or barn-church of the familiar Kara Dağ pattern. The quality was poor throughout, and there was no sign of any decoration.

There are scattered remains of many fine churches in the Boz Dağ cities, notably a large number of "double-columns" and rectangular piers that are considerably superior to any comparable pieces in Kara Dağ (pl. P10, C, D, E). Some of these should be of very early Byzantine date.

Moulded voussoirs, almost unknown in Kara Dağ (1001 Churches, p. 477), occur, built into the Han at Obruk. The mouldings on them are all of late type (cf. the lintel on Ballık Dağ, p. 204). Lintels tended to be very ornate, with a greater variety of patterns than those of Kara Dağ (pl. P10, F). One at Takalı Kuyu (p. 189) is reminiscent of a Karaca Dağ type (SERP, pl. viii), having a central cross flanked by partly stylized vine-scrolls.

Perta and Central Boz DagNOTES

(1) This was the conclusion arrived at by Ramsay (CR xxiii, 1909, p. 7), and it has been borne out by subsequent visitors to the area, including Sir William Calder. Two of Ramsay and Callender's other conclusions (CR, loc. cit.), firstly that there was an ancient city at Obruk (on which see pp. 202 f), and secondly that the inscriptions mentioning Perta, of which one is given in full and the other in part, served as milestones, rather than structural columns, seem much less likely.

(2) G. Millet, L'Ancien Art Serbe; les Églises, Paris 1919, pp. 152 ff., gives several examples, and derives the plan from Athos. One difference between these Serbian churches and that on Ballík Dağ^ı is that the former almost always have large, domed narthexes carrying bell-towers. Numerous other examples of the plan are given by A. Deroko, Monumental and Decorative Architecture in Medieval Serbia, Belgrade 1953, pp. 214 ff. of Serbo-Croat text, p. 350 of English summary. For the later spread of the type NE across the Balkans see Millet, op.cit., pp. 196 ff.; P. Henry, Les Églises de la Moldavie du Nord, Paris 1930, gives a whole series, of which only one, the Holy Trinity at Siret (ibid. p. 50), is likely to be older than the 15th century.

Perta and Central Boz DagInscriptions

189. BURUN KUYU, by a well. Block of greyish-white marble, a apparently the upper part of a large moulded base. Later re-used as a voussoir. Cut off above, below, left and right. H. 32 plus, w. 83 plus, th. 73 plus, lett. 3. Pl. 30.

Αὐτοκράτορι Νερούα Τραϊά-
[νῶ]

Part of a dedication to Trajan.

190. HACINUMAN (Haci Loğman), in the wall of a house. White marble architrave block, broken right, cut off left and above. H. 35 plus, w. 53 plus, th. 35, lett. 7.0 - 7.5. Pl. 31.

Αὐτοκράτορος
--]οκλῆς Σε[---
--]εἰς κατὰς[κευην---

Part of the same architrave as MAMA viii, no. 259, and probably of that published in CR xxiii, pp. 7 f. Probably a dedication to Hadrian.

191. BURUN KUYU, on the steps of a house. Grey-white marble bomos. H. 41, w. 24, 22-23, 25, th. 22, 20, 22, lett. 2.0 - 2.8 Pl. 31.

Π[α]πιδς
Μιθρδδτου
Δι' Ἀκουσεω
εὐχην.

192. GIYMIR, in a house. Rough marble bomos, with sinking in upper surface representing a patera. H. 32, w. 18, 16, -, th. 13, -, 16, lett. 1.5 - 2.5. Pl. 31.

Ἀπόλλω-
νει θεῶ
ἐπηκῶ
παιδὸς Ν[ι-]

5. κλειδίου
vac. εὐχῆν.

193. BURUN KUYU, on the steps of a house. Very rough marble altar. H. 38, w. 17, 15, 17, th. 14, 12, 16, lett. 2-3. Pl. 31.

Θεῶ
ὑψισ-
τω
εὐχῆν.

5. ἰδῶ-
ν
ὑπερ[ρ]
ὑγ[εῖδς]

194. ZULMANDANIN (Zulmandar) Hani, in the wall of a cemetery. Gabled lid of ossuary, in greyish-white marble, with acroteria at the corners. H. 20, w. 57, th. 49, lett. 3.5 - 4.0. Pl. 33.

Μηνόδωρον
Τυρδιννοῦ καὶ
τῆς γυναικός.

The inscription is apparently complete.

195. MERNEK, in the steps of a house in the lower mahalle.

Greyish-white marble block, broken or buried above, right and behind. H. 27 plus, w. 152 plus, th. 46 plus, lett. 3.5. Pl. 33

[---]ΛΕΩ[---]ΔΕΩ[---εε---]τον λεγόμενον
 γῆ κατέχει γνωμῆς ἄξιον ἡμιθεῶν vac.
 καὶ τὴν δαμάρτη τουδε βαλβίλλαν πλυν[?
 σωφροσύνη φι[---]λανδρία τε Πηνελόπη ἴσην.

1.4 The two (or three) letters missing seem to be an erased error.

196. MERNEK, in the yard of Mustafa Kurt. Crystalline grey marble column with female figure in small sunk panel; cut off above, probably when reused in a church, since there is a setting for a small metal cross low down on the back. H. 259 plus, diam. 35 - 44, lett. 3.5 - 4.0. Pl. P10.

Εὐφραῖς Ἐρω-
 τι τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτ-
 ῆς μνήμης leaf
leaf Χάριν leaf

197. KÜÇÜK BORUK (or Burnak) in the street. Octagonal pillar of bluish marble, with dowel-hole in upper end for attachment of a moulded coping or capital. H. 134, w. 56, th. 58, lett. 3 - 3.5. On the face to right of the inscribed face, incised cross, presumably of later date. Pl. 33.

Φιλοφρον
 Ἀρχελα-
 ον ἡρω-

5. α υῖόν leaf
 φιλόνι-
 ου Σε-
 λευκου
 Φιλόνι-
 ους Ἐπλ-
 10. φροδει-
 τος ἐ-
 κ των ἱ-
 σίων λν-
 ἐσθη - leaf
 15. leaf σεν leaf
 Published MAMA viii, no 264.

198. KÜÇÜK BORUK, lying loose on the E side of the settlement (yayla). Limestone stele with pediment and lateral pilasters. Left side and mouldings cut away. H. 183, w. -, 47 plus, -, th. -, 28, -, lett. 2 - 3. In the pediment; spindle and distaff, female figure, unidentified object. Below the inscription; wreath with two ivy leaves growing from the top, two incised crescents. Pl. 33

- Τειμοθ[εος]
 Σφαιρου Μ[α?]
 θυγατρί μνη-
 μης χάριν ναε
 5. ὅς σε λν τουτο
 ἀδικησει ἐννε[α]
 μήνεις ἐχσιτ[ο]
 κατὰ χθονίους
 κεχολωμένους

1.2 Μδ or Βδ, rather than τη.

11.6 ff. Cf. MAMA viii, nos. 234 ff, and CB, i, no. 95.

199. GIYMIR, in the wall of a house. Coarse grey marble stele, broken in two. a) broken above, below and left. H. 54 plus, w. 44 plus, th. -, lett. 2.5 - 3.2. b) broken above and left. H. 70 plus, w. 44 plus, th. 20, lett. 2.8 - 3.5. Below the inscription, crescent and leaf. Pl. 34.

a Αγδθδνγελως
Πδοικρδτωυς τει-
μης χάριν έπωι-
ησεν έδντῶν κδι

5. [γ]υνδικῶς Λιδος
vac leaf vac.

ός σε ζν κdkην
[X]ειρδ προσένεν-
[κγ] έξει Μηνδς κδ-

10. τλXθ[ονίου]ς κ[ε]
[X]ολωμ[ε]νους

11. 9-11. cf. no. 198.

200. BÜYÜK BORUK (or Burnak), by the mosque. Grey and white marble column, broken below. H. 73 plus, diam. 37 - 39, lett. 2.5 - 3.0. Pl. 33.

Τιτος Απολλω-
νίου Νεαρχο(υ)
τω εῷ κδι Τdτd
τη θυγατρί

5. μνημης ένε-
κ[εν]

201. GIYMIR, in a yard. Plain ossuary of greyish-white marble, without lid, said to have been dug up on the mound. H. 23 (int. 12), w. 48 (int. 35), th. 33 (int. 18), lett. 2.5 - 3.5, with traces of red paint. Pl. 33

Οὐδ' αὖτις Βελλης
 ἔατ' ὦ καὶ γυναικί (καὶ?)
 Τεκνοῦσ' leaf

The text is complete. The leaf was not cut in the stone but merely added in paint.

202. GIYMIR, about to be built into a house. Grey marble homos, with rough back, the sides marked out with guide-lines showing that, if completed, the thickness would have been the same as the width. H. 74, w. 32, 26-28, 36, th. 37, 32, 37, lett. 2.5 - 2.7. Pl. 33

Λ [---5-] H
 [- - - - -]
 A [---c9---]
 Αὐρ. Μάκριν [α]?
 5. νῖω γλυκὺτ [α]
 τω μνήμης
 Χάριν leaf

11. 1-3 appear to have been intentionally erased.

1.4 Probably not Μάκριν [ω], as the upper left corner of the omega would still be visible, if the spacing was maintained.

203. GIYMIR, in a yard; grey marble stele with sunk panel. Mouldings at sides cut away, whole stone recut as a column-base

H. 72 plus, w. 43 plus, th. 23 plus, panel 40 x 30, lett. 3.5 - 4.5. Pl. 34.

Ἰερὰξ Σε-
λευκόν
Σελευκῶ
πατρὶ καὶ

5. μητρὶ Τάτῃ
μνήμης ἐ-
νεκεν.

204. GIYMIR, in the wall of a house. Marble stele with lateral pilasters, broken above and below. H. 27 plus, w. 48 (panel 30), th. -, lett. 2.5 - 2.8. Pl. 34.

Βαβείς Ποσι-
δωνίου Πασι-
κράτου Σελευ-
κῶ υἱῷ καὶ Τά-
τῃ

5. τῇ ἐγγονῇ μνή-
μης χάριν.

205. GIYMIR, in the wall of a yard. Greyish-white crystalline marble fragment, broken all sides. H. 24 plus, w. 41 plus, th. 20 plus, lett. 3 - 3.8. Pl. 34.

Αὐτ. Βαλβός Αρ[τὴ κατέσ-]
κεύχσεν τὸ [μνημεῖον]
ἐκ τῶν ἰσίων[ν Τάτῃ τῇ]
[γ]υναικὶ καὶ [ἐαυτῷ]

5. [μνήμης ἐνεκεν]

Restoration exempli gratia.

206. GIYMIR, in a lane. Greyish-white marble column, plain above, broken below. H. 27 plus, diam. 27, lett. 4-5.5. Pl. 34.

Μδτρω-
 υδ τω γλ-
 [υκντῆτω κτλ.]

207. BURUN KUYU, by the well. Undecorated limestone cornice-block, complete, hollowed out above to make a trough. H. 29, w. 182, th. 54, lett. 3.5 - 4.0. Pl. 34.

Νεστωρ Κδοτορος ἐποίησα το μνημειον ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν

The inscription was completed on a separate block.

208. KOÇAŞ. Upper part white marble column, broken below, upper moulding damaged. H. 30, diam. 33 plus, lett. 2.5. Pl. 34.

[-----]
 Δοκίμεύς.

1.1 The name is completely lost. The inscription must be a mason's mark. The marble is probably not from Dokimion. Masons were cheaper to transport than their materials.

209. MERNEK, in the wall of a house. Grey marble stele with lateral pilasters, probably broken above. H. 92 plus, w. 33, th. c. 20, lett. 2 - 3. Guide-lines above the first three lines. Pl. 34.

Κυριδκο-
 υ<κου> Ἀππ-
 η γλυκντῆτ-
 η θυγατρί μ-
 νήμης χεί-
 ριν.
 5.

11. 1-2 Error for Κυρίδης ? Or the first line may be missing.

210. MERNEK, on a dung-heap. Coarse marble stele with sunk panel, broken above and bottom right corner. H. 75 plus, w. 66 plus, th. 33. In the panel, monogrammatic cross. Pl. 34

[ὁ δεινὸς καὶ Ζ-]?

ἐμνήσθη [ἡσυχίας]

μεν τῇ γλυ-

κυστάτῃ ἡ-

5. μων μητρὶ

Αὐρ. Μαρ-

κεν μνή-

μης χάριν.

211. HACINUMAN, by a well. Limestone slab with large panel outlined with cavetto moulding. H. 171, w. 62, th. 24, lett. 3.5 - 5.0. Below the inscription, Latin cross, upside-down in relation to the inscription. Pl. 35

cross εὐθελ

καταξι-

τε Λητο-

ης ὁ τῆς

5. λητορίας

μνημῆς.

11. 3-4 The name is certain.

212. GIYMIR, in a stable just W of the mound. Marble stele with flattened pediment, below which is a Maltese cross in a circle, then inscription in moulded panel. H. 85, w. 24-37, th. -, panel 45 x 14-18, lett. 1.9 - 2.9. Pl.35.

Παυλος

κε Σωσδν-

δρος κε Ζο-

λλος τῷ ι-

5. δῖω εὐεργε-
τη καὶ μδισ-
τορι Βικτορι
κε ξυλογλυ-
φω ἀνέστ-

10. ησδν μνή-
μης χάριν
2 leaves

213. GIYMIR, in the wall of an oven. White marble stele, broken below. H. 28 plus, w. 24, th. 17, lett. 1.8 - 3.2. Pl.35.

cross

Κυρος

Βραδου-

κώμης

5. vac

214. KOÇAS, in the wall of a house. Marble stele with roughly pointed top. H. 72, w. 24, th. -, lett. 2.5 - 3.5. Pl.35.

cross

Zwn

πδρθερος

Συνη

215. GIYMIR, in the wall of a house. Grey marble block, broken left. H. 18, w. 40 plus, th. -, lett. 8 - 9.5. Pl. 35.

cross A Ω A cross.

LYKAONIA

Savatra and Kana

The southern section of Boz Dağ, S of Akbağ Beli, is quite a formidable little range, 30 km. long from NW to SE, 10-15 km. wide and often more than 500 m. above the plain. Two passes, Divanlar Beli and Göçü Beli, lead over it from the Ikonian plain to Savatra. On the east of the mountain a road, not shown on the Peutinger Table, must have run along the edge of the plain (p.172) and this must have been the principal reason for the prosperity of Savatra and Kana, the two cities situated at the eastern foot of the mountain.

Savatra, described by Strabo (568) merely as a near Garsaoura, was the more important of the two, striking coins from Trajan to Philip (HN(2), p. 714). Its situation at the modern Yalıbayat is assured by the presence there of a large number of inscriptions (JHS xxii, 1902, pp. 371 ff; SERP, pp. 158 ff; MAMA viii, nos. 226 ff.; below, nos. 216 ff.) including at least three mentioning the name of the city (below, no. 216). The site was described by Cronin (JHS loc.cit), when the yayla of Yalıbayat was still too small to have swallowed up the remains of its predecessor. It is now a flourishing village, almost a town, and in a cursory examination I saw nothing ancient apart from individual blocks and inscriptions, and a system of stone-lined shafts connected by an underground channel, which appeared to be an aqueduct or collecting-channel tapping the springs in the bottom of the valley behind the village. This

the villagers were cleaning out in the hope of reusing it. To judge from the Christian gravestones used in the lining of the shafts (nos. 222, 224), it was probably of Byzantine date.

Kana, the modern Gene, was identified in 1904 by Ramsay and Callander (SERP pp. 161 ff.). The site has never been adequately described, and my own two visits, with Professor Calder in 1954 and with Mr. Hall in 1957, were both too brief for a proper examination of it. The Roman site was probably on the edge of the plain, where the modern village stands, but there is said to be also a castle and extensive signs of settlement on and around a steep rocky hill just to the SW. Like Perta, it apparently issued no coins, and the earliest certain evidence of its having been a city is a dedication to Trajan (SERP, p. 162, no. 18, revised in MAMA viii, no. 211).

Savatra and Kana

Inscriptions

216. YALIBAYAT, in a yard. Greyish-white marble slab, moulded above, broken above, below and right. H. 65 plus, th. -, w. 55 plus, lett. 4 - 4.5 (all measurements approximate). Pl. 36.

T. Flavium T.f.

Titinianum bu-

le et popul. Sav-

atr. fil(ium) oppidi. leaf

11. 3-4 Savatra is also recorded epigraphically in JHS xxi, 1902, p. 371, no. 144; SERP, p. 158, no. 2; MAMA viii, nos. 228, 231.

217. YALIBAYAT, in the yard of the school. Grey-blue marble stele. H. 115, w. 44, 37, 44, th. 34, 29, 35, lett. 0.8 - 1.1. Below the inscription, recessed panel with male and female figures. Pl. 35.

[-----]
 [---] ἀρχαίου κεδυή καὶ σωφρονὶ καὶ φιλοτεκνῶ
 [αθ] ἀνδρῶν ἱερεῖα, δις ἀρχιερεῖα ἀνδρῶν,
 [β] ὡμον τὸν μνήμης ἐρικυδέος εἰδρυσε Βοκχ[ος]
 5. [εἰς]ος τῶνδε Βροτοῖσι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πύθε[ς]
 vac ὅδε vac

1.1 Ancient erasure.

1.3 For another imperial high-priestess cf. JRS xxi, 1902, p. 371, no. 144.

1.4 The last word might be (ἡ)ποκλος, but the reading given is closer to the traces on the stone.

218. YALIBAYAT, in a house. Stele of greyish-white marble, with pediment, said to have been found in the ruins of the "Kale". Slightly broken above. H. 38 plus, w. 19,22, th. 9, lett. 1.2 - 1.8. In the pediment, a crescent. Pl. 35.

Καλοκα-
ipos.

The inscription is complete.

219. YALIBAYAT, outside a house. Grey marble column-drum, reused as a gravestone. H. 99, diam. 40, lett. 3.0 - 4.5. Pl. 36.

Καλοκουρnis
Αλεξ[α]νδρου
τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ
μου συνβίω

5. Ὀλυμπιδι
μνήμης Χάριν.
Μακεδονis τῇ
συνβίω μου Δουλῇ
γλυκυτάτῃ

10. μνήμης Χάριν.

220. YALIBAYAT, by the school. Grey marble column, roughly finished. H.133, diam. 30-34, lett. 2.3 - 4.0. Below the inscription, pedimental niche with crescent in pediment and two defaced figures in niche. Pl. 36.

Σιλωνδρος
Σωζομένω
καὶ Τάβιτῃ γλυ-
κυτάτοις γον-

5. ΕΝ ΟΙΣ ΜΥΗΜΗΣ
ΕΝΕΚΕΝ.

221. YALIBAYAT, in a yard. Grey marble slab, very roughly cut, broken below. H. 58, w. 61, th. 8, lett. 2.5 - 6.5. Pl. 36.

ΤΩ ΓΛΥΚΥΤΕ-
ΤΩ ΜΟΥ ΑΝΔΡΙ
ΒΕΒΙΔΝΩ ΣΩΦΔΝ-
ΝΔ ΤΩ ΙΔΙΩ ΔΝ-

5. ΣΠΙ ΜΥΗΜΗΣ
ΧΑΡΙΝ vac
ΑΝΕΣΤΗΣΕΝ
monogrammatic
cross.

222. YALIBAYAT, in a house; said to be from the aqueduct (p.218)
Grey marble block, probably the upper moulding of a statue-base,
moulded front, left, right, cut off behind. H. 17, w. 47, 35,
th. 27, 19, lett. 1.2 - 3.5. The stone was subsequently reused
as a gravestone and inscribed on the bottom surface. Pl. 36.

ΤΩ ΓΛΥΚΥ-
ΤΑΤΩ ΝΕΙ-
Ω ΕΙΩΔΝΗ
Η ΜΗΤΗΡ ΑΥΡ.

5. ΜΑΤΩΡΝΔ (sic)
ΜΥΗΜΗΣ (sic)
ΧΑΡΙΝ.

223. YALIBAYAT, in the valley behind the village. Rough marble block, with projection at top, apparently complete, but split down the centre. H. 142, w. 55, th. 23, lett. 2.8 - 4.5. Pl. 36.

Χαριτων τη
ισιδ συμβίω

Σουσαννη

καὶ τῷ νύῳ

5. Μαξιμῳ οἷς

εὐχα[ρ]ιστῷ

παρὰ Θεῷ μν-

ήρης χάριν

ἀνεστήσῃ

10. τὴν στήλην.

224. YALIBAYAT, in a shaft of the aqueduct (p.218). Coarse marble block, buried below, broken above and behind. H. 70, w. 29, th. 40, lett. 2.5 - 3.5. Pl. 36.

τῷ τῆς μ-

ἀκαρεῖς

μνημνη-

ς Εἰουλείω

5. τῷ πρεσβ-

υτέρῳ Μο-

υσίος ὁ ἀ-

δεφὸς ἀν-

τοῦ ἀνέ-

10. στήσεν τ-

ην στήλ-

ην μνή-

μης Χάτ
 ΡΕΙΝ
monogrammatic
cross

225. GENE, in the steps of a house by the mosque; elongated boulder of blue-grey marble, inscribed in incised panel at one end. H. 124, w. 46 (panel 25), th. 40, lett. 2 - 4. In the panel, a spindle. Pl. 37.

Αὐρ. Κυρ [- -]
 νησι βο [υ]
 λευτῆς
 ΚΕ οἱ υἱοὶ δὲ -

5. τῷ ἀνεστη-
 σαν μνήμης
 Χάριν.

11. 1-2 For Κυρίνιος?

226. GENE, in the wall of a house. Fragment of white limestone, broken above, below and left. H. 42 plus, w. 30 plus, th. -, lett. 3 - 5. The inscription appears to have been on a slightly raised panel. Pl. 36.

[τω γ]λυκὺς -
 [τῷ]ω μου ἀν-
 [ερί]Μειρω
 [Δομν]α μνή-

5. [μης Χά]ριν.

Restoration exempli gratia.

227. GENE, in the wall of a yard. White limestone pedimental stele with rough panel, broken above. H. 124, w. 37, th. -, panel 33 x 24, lett. 1.5 - 4.0. Pl. 37.

cross

A Ω
cross ὅποι τοῦ
 ἀγίου καὶ
 ἐνδοξοῦ
 ἰωάννου cross

This appears to be SERP, p. 163, no. 22, or a duplicate of it. In SERP, 1.4 is given ἰοδοτερος, with a fifth line Θύρου and the caution that "the reading in line 4 is hopeless". The stone is very worn indeed.

228. GENE, in a house-well. Grey limestone block, probably complete. H. 82, w. 63, th. 89, letters 3 - 7. Pl. 37.

Βαρδὺς πρ(εσβύτερος)
 see drawing.

1.2 This appears to be Armenian.

LYKAONIA

The Plains South of Lake Tatta

Between Boz Dağ^y and Archelais (Aksaray) lies a vast area of what is, archaeologically speaking, rather unproductive country. The northern parts of it, bordering on Lake Tatta, are flat and marshy, but as one goes further south the flatness is exchanged for dry, rolling downland, always dominated by the vast mass of Hasan Dağ^y at the eastern end of the plain.

The topography is simplified, in a way, by the complete absence of cities and the extreme scantiness of the literary sources. The Peutinger Table (road from Perta to Salaberina, p. 163) and a few brief references in Strabo and Ptolemy, are the only lines that one can follow, except for chance epigraphic discoveries.

In the NW corner of the area, the only reasonably certain identification is Anzoulada at Akören (Oğuzeli), known from a boundary stone (p. 193, no. 3). The site is miserably poor and windswept and most of its inscriptions (JHS xix, 1899, pp. 280 f; MAMA viii, nos. 288 ff; below, no. 233) are of Byzantine date. Two other sites along the fringe of the marshes by the lake, Herkenli and Tuzun HK., are described by Anderson (JHS xix, 1899, pp. 131 ff.).

The NE corner also, though rich in pre-classical sites, has only one classical village to which a name can be fixed; Koropassos, described by Strabo (568) as 120 stades from Garsaoura (Archelais), can be placed with reasonable certainty at

Ak Han (p. 177 ; FOA viii, p. 14), on the Seljuk road from Konya to Aksaray, where there is a mound ^{with} ~~of~~ good Hellenistic and Roman pottery. Another Roman site a little further to the E, near Yapılcan, is very poor indeed.

The three ancient settlements at Ortakuyu, Malır HK and Gideriç, which can probably be equated with the Comitanasso, Ubinnaca and Salaberina of the Peutinger Table, have already been described in AS viii, pp. 225 ff., and there is no point in repeating the description beyond saying that Ortakuyu is ^{part of the plain.} probably the largest ancient village in the central ~~Ardistama~~, as pointed out in HGAM (p. 344) is given by Ptolemy (V, iv, 8) as a city of NW Lykaonia. The location of it at the modern Arisama, not far from the SW corner of Hasan Dağı, (HGAM, loc. cit), is thus not in accordance with Ptolemy's position and rests only on the resemblance of name.

The Plains South of Lake Tatta.Inscriptions

229. HARMAN ÇUKURU (N. of Obruk), on the steps of a house.

Coarse greyish-white marble bomos, probably brought from Boz Dag.

H. 80, w. 33, 26, 33, th. 32, 27, 34, lett. 1.8 - 3.5. Pl. 37.

Δὴ στρατιῶ

μεγιστῶ

Παπιδνος

Βενεφικιδρις

5. καὶ γυνὴ φλα-

κίλλη καὶ νεος

Ἀπελλης

ἱερὸς τε

εὐχῆς χά-

10. πιν.

230. ORTAKUYU, in a stable. Greyish-white marble bomos, broken

in two, upper half chipped left. H. 49, w. 22, 19, 23, th. 20,

17, 20, lett. 1.5 - 2. On the shaft; left, female figure, right,

male figure, between them a snake. Pl. 37.

[Ασ]κληπιῶ

καὶ Ὑγείᾳ

?[κυρ]ινδριος Νου-

[με]ριου ἐπηκ-

Relief

5. νοῖς εὐχῆς.

The drawing is from two separate impressions, neither of which shows clearly the exact relation of the inscription to the edges of the stone.

231. DAYI KUYUSU, a yayla 7 km. S of Ortakuyu, in a well-head. White limestone, broken above. H. 145 plus, w. -, 49, 61, th. -, 36, -, lett. 2 - 3. Above the inscription, arched niche enclosing standing draped male figure. Pl. 37.

[1] οὐλίον καὶ Σελευκον (sic)

οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνεστή[σαν]

ν Δωροθέω τῷ ἀ[δελφῷ]

ναὶ γλυκυτάτῳ μν[ημῆς]

5. [ἐνεκεν]

232. ORTAKUYU, lying loose on N side of the village. Gray-blue marble slab, broken above. H. 58 plus, w. 54, th. 20, lett. 2.5 - 3.5. Pl. 37.

cross ἐνθα κατέκλιτε

ὁ τῆς μεμαρμένης cross

μνήμης Κονον ἀκ(ολουθος?)

233. AKÖREN (Oğuzeli), by a mosque. Limestone slab with moulded border, broken above. The upper part was probably filled by a large cross, of which only the foot remains. H. 105 plus, w. 82, th. 29, lett. 4 - 6. Pl. 38.

cross ἐνθα

κατέκλι-

τε Δομν-

ος υἱος Δ-

5. ομειτίον

Δυνάτου

cross?

LYKAONIA

Hyde

Hyde is known from Pliny, Hierocles, ecclesiastical sources and coins. Pliny puts Ide on the boundary of Galatia and Cappadocia, which fixes the longitude fairly certainly, Hierocles (675) gives it after Barata and before Isauropolis while the coins (HN (2), p. 713) indicate that it formed part of the second-century Koinon of Lykaonia, and bore the epithet Hiera. This combination of circumstances led Ramsay (HGAM, pp. 339 f.; Lycaonia col. 82 ff.), to put it at Karapınar, SE of Kana, on the modern road from Konya to Ereğli and probably on the ancient one Laodikeia-Savatra-Kybistra (p. 172). No epigraphic evidence has been forthcoming, and the conjecture has remained unconfirmed since. In favour of Karapınar, it can be said that, in spite of an almost complete lack of inscriptions, it was obviously an ancient settlement of importance. A very large mound in the town, with pottery ranging from Early Bronze Age to Roman, a good water supply, and the presence of several fine early Turkish buildings, combine to prove this. It is the natural road-centre of a large, if not very prosperous, district. If Ramsay is correct in associating the epithet Hiera with curious natural phenomena, the country to the east of Karapınar has enough of them for several holy cities. A dreary but strangely fascinating waste of sand and pumice dust, with wind-eroded pinnacles of rock dotted about it, begins on the eastern outskirts of the town (pl. PM, A). A little further out is Ak Göl,

a lake of undrinkable bluish water sunk in a depression with almost vertical sides, rather similar to the one at Obruk (p. 202) South of this, another lake, known as Tuz Mekesi, lies in a great round bowl of pumice, and forms a ring about a bare conical hill that rises considerably higher than the edges of the bowl. On the summit grows a single stunted tree (pl. P11,B). The country further to the S, between Tuz Mekesi and Anbar (Sidamaria) is a near-desert of pumice, scattered with other, less spectacular, volcanic cones. Most of this area is useless to man or beast, but it must have left a very powerful impression in the minds of ancient Lykaonians, and might well be the origin of the sanctity of Hyde.

LYKAONIA(?)

Sidamaria

The name of Sidamaria, known only from a dedication to Hadrian (IGR, iii, no. 273; Catalogue Constantinople, i, no. 113, gives full references), was situated at the modern Anbar or Anbararasi. Although apparently a city, it cannot have been of any importance, though it lay at the junction of two important roads (pp. 176, 178). After this, it seems probable that it was included with Laranda in the original province Galatia, and then belonged successively to Antiochiana, Cappadocia, the Koinon of Lykaonia, Diocletianic Isauria or Pisidia and finally Byzantine Lykaonia (possibly Cappadocia Secunda, though the natural frontier at this point should be the marsh between Sidamaria and Kybistra).

The modern village lies with its back to a large mound covered with Roman and Byzantine pottery. A net-work of catacomb-like passages cut in the mound appears to be a late Roman or Byzantine place of burial, though apart from a stone disc with roughly incised decoration, rolling in a groove to act as a door, it contains nothing of any interest. The rolling door is a common feature in tombs of the Roman period in Syria and Mesopotamia.

There are now no remains of buildings above ground, but the quantity of ancient stones in the houses is impressive (cf. WE, p. 15).

Sidamaria's principal claim to fame is the great sarcophagus now in the Istanbul Museum (Catalogue Constantinople, i, no. 112; Sardis V, i, pp. 40 ff.) but the character of the remains on the site suggests that work of this quality was quite exceptional there.

At Kale Köyü, 4 km. to the SW, "important ruins" were reported by Callander (SERP, p. 164); in 1957 we were unable to find any signs of ancient occupation. There seems to be no positive ground for regarding it as the site of Kadena (Social Basis, p. 105).

Sidamara
Inscriptions

234. Between KALE KÜYÜ and KARAAĞAÇ, in the foundations of a culvert just to the west of a Selcuk bridge. Whitish limestone block, broken left, possibly also right and above. H. 83, w. 60 plus, th. -, lett. 4.5 - 5.5. Pl. 38.

[Δωρόθεος Γα]ον Μδ και Επ-
[ιφανη τέκνοις κα]τεσκευδσεν
[ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνδ]λωματων τῶ
[δε πατρι ἐξον ἐστ]δι. οὐδενι ἔξεσ-
5. [τα] ἐκβλεῖν τλ λ]εῖψανδ. εἰσ-
[οῖσει τῇ πολει κ]δι τῷ ἱερῷ
[φισκῷ δηναριδ π]εντακισ-
[χιλιδ]

Restoration exempli gratia.

235. AKÇAŞAHR, built into the porch of the mosque. Creamy limestone block, broken left and above. H. 34 plus, w. 51 plus, th. -, lett. 3. Remains of panel moulding below and right. Pl. 38.

Γην Δομν[η]ν και Δε-
κμος και Οὐιτλεος οἱ
Νιγρον και Πρειμδ και [Δο-]
μνηνις ἡ Μ[η]τη[ρ] αὐτῶν
5. εὐχαριστυς ἐρεκεν.

Domnenis appears to have been married twice, to the unnamed father of Prima and to Niger the father of her other children.

236. KARAAĞAC, in a yard. Brown limestone stele with rounded top. H. 54, w. 34, th. 20, lett. 1.5 - 2.0. In a sunk panel, male figure in cloak and boots giving loaf (?) to child similarly clothed. The inscription has ruled guide-lines. Pls. 38, P II.

Γ. Νοῦμεριον

Γαυιλίου ἡ γυνὴ

μνήμης X vac á vac pív.

1.2 Γαυιλίου was probably intended.

1.3 The gaps are caused by natural holes in the stone.

237. ANBARARASI, in the steps of a house. Grey marble block, buried below, chipped at both sides, broken behind. H. 28 plus, w. 124, th. 75 plus, lett. 3.5 - 4.0. Pl. 39.

vac? [-----]

[κδο] τοῦ Αδ[] ν. ἀλλ' οἰκονομήσαντα
[ἐν] τειμῶς [ἐ]ν Ἀδρανδῶ ἐτη τριδικοντα
[οἱ] υἱοὶ μνήμης ἔδρυν.

1.1 There are distinct signs of letters in the second half of the line, but none in the first half, where there is no room for them on the stone.

1.2 The names Nestor and Kastor are both common in Lycaonia. Lagnilla or Larnilla, neither apparently known, would fit the traces, and appears to be the name of the owner of Adrandos, not a metronymic; cf. AS ix, 1959, p.99, no.52.

1.3 Adrandos is not otherwise known.

238. KARAAĞAC, in a lane. Grey limestone slab, said to be from Hüyük Burnu, broken above. H. 117 plus, w. 92, th. 15, lett. 4.

Above the inscription, three tall Latin crosses (?) Pl. 39.

cross ἐν θλ κτλ κτε
 Νησις [πρ(εσβύτερος)] καὶ ὑκο-
 νομος

The drawing is not based on any facsimile and is accurate only as regards the shape and decoration of the stone.

239. KAVUKLAR, in a garden opposite the school. Blue marble slab, broken in two. a broken above and right, h. 45, w. 46, th. -, lett. 3-6. b broken above and left, h. 40, w. 36, th. -, lett. 2.5 - 5.0. The two pieces almost join. Inscription in tabula ansata, with incised "arcading" above. Pl. 38.

cross ἐν θλ [κ]τλ κτε
 Στέφανο[s] ὁ εὐλβ(εστδτος)
 ἀρχιδιδκ(ων) ΓΟΥΝΔ
 ?]ΟΥΡΙ cross

ll. 4-5 . Apparently an abbreviated ethnic; Γουνδουρι(της)?

240. ANBARARASI, in the steps of a house. Blue marble slab with tabula ansata, broken above and right, buried left. H. 83 (tabula 51), w. 50 plus, th. 16, lett. 7.5 - 9.5. At left of tabula, a wreath. Pl. 39.

ἐν θ[αδε κτε]
 Θεοσ[εβιος ?]
 πρεσβ[υτερος]

241. KAVUKLAR, in a garden opposite the school. Blue marble slab with geometric design, broken above and left. H. 73 plus,

w. 61 plus, th. — , lett. 6-7. Above the inscription, Greek cross in circle. Pl. 39.

[μ]νήμη
 ?[πδν]λειλλδ-
 ?[ς]

242. ANBARARASI, by the mound; blackish limestone slab. H. 196, w. 96, th. 16, lett. 6.5 - 9.0. Below the inscription, which is incised, upside down, in a tabula ansata, is a large Latin cross with semicircular base, flanked by two plain bosses and the letters A and W in relief (22 and 9 cm. resp.). Pl. 39.

μνήμη
 Σισινίου

243. ANBARARASI, in a lane. Blue marble slab with rounded top. H. 169, w. 64, th. 15, lett. 2-3. Inscription in tabula ansata; above, Greek cross in circle; below, Latin cross. Pl. 40

Μ μνήμη
 νεοφοτισ-
 τῶν Ἀετίου
 καὶ Εὐμεθίδς.

1.1 The first letter was perhaps intended to be a form of chi-rho monogram, or may have been an engraver's error.

LYKAONIA

Derbe

The site of Derbe must be sought somewhere in the area of Sidrova, some 18 km. NE of Laranda. This was suggested by Honigmann (on Hierocles 675), and confirmed by a dedication found in 1956 at Kerti Hüyük, 7 km. NE of Sidrova. In publishing this inscription (AS vii, pp. 147-151; offprint in folder of plates) I provisionally accepted Kerti Hk. ^(pl. PH, C) as the site of Derbe, in spite of the absence there of other stones or any evidence for Byzantine occupation. In 1958, making a flying visit to Sidrova itself, Mr. Gough and I were shown a further inscription, the epitaph of Michael, bishop of Derbe (no. 245), as well as the site, 4 km. NNE of the village, from which it was said to have been brought. This is still known as Devri Şehri, and our suggestion that "Dervi" was the correct Byzantine pronunciation was indignantly rejected. The "City of Devri" proved to be a flat site, not a mound, about 500 m. in diameter. The pottery ranged from Hellenistic to Seljuk, and there were a number of large rough limestone columns lying on the surface. One possible reason for the flatness of the site is that the ground-level around it has been raised by the deposition of silt from Ibrala Dere during winter floods; certainly the whole area is marshy, though drainage works are now in progress, and occupation levels, revealed by what are said to be old saltpetre workings, continue below the level of the surrounding marsh.

The evidence for Devri Şehri having been the site of Derbe is strong, but cannot be regarded as quite conclusive until yet

another site, mentioned by Ramsay (Lykaonia, col. 88), as "a very large mound rising bodily from the plain" (apparently that marked on the Turkish map 5 km. ENE of Sidrova) has been investigated. It is an almost invariable rule in Lykaonia that a city should be looked for on and around a large mound capable of being fortified, and there seems no reason why Derbe, which took a prominent part in the power-politics of Lykaonia in the first century B.C., should be an exception to the rule. For older placings of Derbe see RE (s.v. Derbe).

The territory of Derbe probably included all the eastern end of the Karaman plain, being bounded on the NE by that of Sidamaria, on the SW by that of Laranda and on the NW by that of Barata. The soil of the plain is heavy and, if proper use were made of the water of the Ibrala Dere, could be very productive. The hills to the SE, towards Ibrala, are barren and were probably as sparsely inhabited in ancient times as they are today. Derbe must have lain on a road from Laranda to Kybistra, probably via Sidamaria (p. 178).

Other ancient sites probably to be assigned to the territory of Derbe include a curious fortified settlement near a yayla south of Karaağaç, which appears to be the Cinasınören of the Turkish map. At the centre of the site (pl. 40) is a tower of rubble and mud about 10 m. square in plan. Around it lies a roughly rectangular enclosure about 2 hectares in area, protected by an outer wall of rubble and mud with no surviving facing. The area within the wall is filled with a tangle of rubble walls, belonging to houses with small yards attached, while outside it further houses, apparently with larger yards

or gardens, shade off gradually into cemeteries. A number of plain but well finished Byzantine double-columns are still lying on the site, while other pieces from a church have been removed to Karaağaç. The pottery is Roman as well as Byzantine, but the layout of the place in its present form can hardly be earlier than the Arab Wars.

Derbe
Inscriptions

244. AŞIRAN YAYLASI, in a well belonging to Tahir Atceken.
Limestone block, broken left. H. 35, w. 100 plus, th. -, lett.
3.0 - 3.5. Pl. 40.

ἡ σεινδ ----] εἰσου θυγατρ
-----] ωρνυτιω τω ἐκτῆς
ἀνδρὶ καὶ ἐκ]τῇ]ώση ἐποίησε
το] μνημῆ. crescent.

245. SIDROVA, in the house of Kerim Kīrat. Blackish marble slab,
broken left and below. H. 69 plus, w. 64, th. 10, lett. 3.5 -
4.5. The main inscription is enclosed in a circular medallion
(diam. 37), the final word in a separate medallion in the
upper right corner (diam. 11). The slab has a raised border
(w. 8). Pls. P II.

In the larger medallion

Ἰνδ(ικτιωνος) δὲ ἐκν-
μ(ι)θι δ θεοφιλε-
στατος Μιχαὶλ
ἐπισκοπος Δ-

5. ερβις ἡμερ-
α γ'

In the smaller medallion

Ἰουνι-
<ι>ων

For another bishop at Sidrova, see JHS, xxii, 1902, p. 357, no. 116.

LYKAONIA

Barata

Barata was placed by Ramsay (Lycaonia, col. 82, 1001 Churches pp. 17 ff.) at Maden Şehir, in a hollow at the northern foot of Kara Dağ; while the proof is not conclusive, depending mainly on the order of Hierocles (675) and on an incomplete road Ikonion - Barata - Tyana, given by the Peutinger Table (p.175f), it is sufficiently certain to cause no grave misgivings.

The whole valley of Maden Şehir is full of ruins, and the lack of any inscriptions of the Roman period commensurate with the dignity of a coin-striking city such as Barata (BMC Lycaonia etc., p. xix), is not surprising in view of the great development of the place in Byzantine times. One tomb with a pyramidal roof (1001 Churches, pp. 230 ff.) is almost certainly pre-Byzantine, and while there are plenty of parallels for the existence of imposing tombs far from the nearest city, its presence does suggest a settlement of some size.

The description of Maden Şehir and of the upper site at Değile in 1001 Churches cannot be improved upon without excavation. All the buildings standing fifty years ago have suffered further damage, and some have been completely destroyed; Miss Bell's accuracy and clarity of description ^{are} ~~is~~ impressive and stand ~~the~~ text of being read on the site. Apart from a more accurate general plan there is little hope of adding much to our knowledge of the Byzantine city. A few of the churches

may be mentioned simply to show how much has been lost since 1909.

No. 1. Most of the late vaulting of the N aisle has been destroyed, but the rest of the church is still in a fairly good state.

No. 4. Nothing except the NE corner and part of the apse remains. It was formerly one of the better preserved churches.

No. 5. Stone-robbers were at work in the narthex; of the rest, only the outline of the apse and some of the columns were visible.

No. 8. is now a shapeless pile of rubble.

No. 9. The dome has fallen and the plan is no longer distinguishable.

No. 31. Has suffered less than most (compare pl.P12,B with 1001 Churches fig. 120).

No. 32. The interior has been gutted and the upper part of the W facade destroyed (pl.P12,A; 1001 Churches, fig. 173)

Several other churches seem to have been lost entirely, or at least are not readily identifiable on the general plan.

From its position on the N side of Kara Dağ it is probably fair to assume that most of the territory of the city lay to the north of the mountain, while the plain to S, E and W belonged to Derbe, Laranda and Ilistra. On the NW lay the great marsh of Pınarbaşı, on the NE a scatter of hills that might well be worth further exploration.

Kızıl Kale, at the SE corner of the marsh (11 km. NW of Maden Şehir), is one of the most interesting sites in the whole area. It stands on an isolated conical hill about 100 m. high and is mainly remarkable for The Iron Age Monument described by

Ramsay (1001 Churches, pp. 505ff.). The fortified settlement on top of the hill appears from its pottery to be entirely Hellenistic, while the Greek inscription on the "throne" (no.247) and a very badly preserved church at the summit testify to the continuing sanctity of the site.

Berata
Inscriptions

246. EGILMEZ, in the wall of a house. White limestone bomos with cylindrical top. H. 86, w. 44, 39, 43, th. -, lett. 2.5-3.0. On the shaft, in relief, ivy-plant growing from vase. Pl. 40.

ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ.

Πλουτωνι

καὶ Κορῇ θεοῖς

ἐπηκοοῖς Φλ.

5. Λουπὸς δ' κε

Οὐεττιος εὐ-

ναί Χην. ναί

εὐτυχί.

247. KIZIL DAĞ, on a horizontal face of trachytic rock SE of the "throne". W. of inscription 48, lett. 4 - 6. Incised above the inscription, five pairs of jumping-weights, the pair on the extreme right less neatly cut than the rest. Pl. 41.

Κράτερος Ἐμοκράτου[ς?]

ἱερεὺς ἐπηδησεν.

The inscription is probably complete, but it is possible that three or four letters are missing at the end of line 2. It appears to record victory (on five occasions?) in some local games, rather than a suicide.

LYKAONIA

Laranda, Ilistra, Posala and Kodylessos

Laranda, the modern Karaman, emerged in the 2nd century A.D. as the metropolis of the Koinon of Lykaonia (HN(2) p. 714), and had probably been the main commercial centre of the south Lykaonian plain for some time before that, since it lay at the end of one of the easiest routes across the Taurus (p. 175).

The name Karaman, given to it by the Karamanoğlu dynasty in the 13th century, has still not entirely superseded the earlier Laranda (Turkish Larendé or Darende). Traces of pre-Turkish settlement are negligible apart from the very high mound at the W end of the town, on which the Karamanoğlu castle stands. The town is a pleasant one, fairly well watered by streams, and has several old Turkish buildings, of which Ibrahim Bey Imareti and Hatuniye Medresesi are probably the finest.

Ilistra, the modern Ilisira, 17 km. W of Laranda, is known from Hierocles and the Notitiae, and from an inscription at Karaman (SERP p. 177, no. 72), as well as from its coins (HN(2) p. 714).

The modern village lies beside a large mound, with a flat top about 150 m. in diameter, showing signs of having once been fortified. Most of the pottery is Roman, as are most of the stones in the old mosque, but there are no inscriptions to be seen.

8 km. further to the WNW, Kasaba (Gaferiyat) which, confusingly, is the administrative centre of the nahiye of Ilisira,

is also situated around a mound with a fair quantity of Roman pottery. It has been identified by Ramsay with the bishopric Pyrgoi (HGAM, p. 346; Lycaonia, col. 80; cf. p. 177). Apart from two pieces of sculpture in a local style (nos. 252, 253) and one quite illegible epitaph there were no other Classical remains, while the greater part of the walls, which for lack of evidence to the contrary I assume to be Turkish, has been pulled down.

Posala was recognized by Ramsay (Lycaonia col. 73) as the modern Bosola (Üzyurt), where there is a low mound, as well as an early mosque. Numerous ancient stones are scattered about the village (inscriptions WE nos. 18 f.). Losta or Zosta (now Akar Köy) a little further to the W, is also an ancient site and the name is presumably ancient. The villagers say that the ancient stones there come from a church inside the village, rather than from the small mound just to the N.

Kodylessos. The large mound Güdelisin Hk. must have been the site of Kodylessos, mentioned in an inscription found 30 km. further to the west (Denkmäler, no. 282). The similarity of name is too close to be accidental.

Many other modern villages in southern Lycaonia retain their ancient names. In the area between the Çarşamba and Kybistra alone, Illetre Öreni, Losta, Mandasun, Masara, Davgandos, Kılbasan, Cinasın, Orzala and Ibrala are probably all ancient names in origin, although one or two of them contain elements that appear to be Turkish, or rather always contained elements susceptible of Turkicisation.

Laranda, Ilistra, Posala and KodylessosInscriptions

248. ORTAOBA, in the porch of the mosque. Whitish limestone
bomos, broken below and behind. H. 72 plus, w. 58, 43, -,
th. 56 plus, 44 plus, -, lett. 3.0 - 4.5. Pl. 41.

Αἰλῖος Φροντ-
των Ἀκυλλιδ
? Τερ]τιδ γυ[νδικι?

249. MANDASUN, in the wall of a house. Limestone block, broken
above. H. 60, w. 42, th. 40, lett. 5.0 - 7.5. Pl. 41.

Ἀππιδς
Γαίου
ἐποίησεν

250. MANDASUN, in the wall of a house. Trachyte pedimental stele,
with rosette in pediment, broken above and below. H. 70 plus,
w. 43, th. -, lett. 4 - 6. Pl. 41.

⊙ ραδς
ἀνεστησεν
τον ἀνδρα
αὐτῆς
5. Ἀππιδς
[Α]ππιδς Γαίου

251. KASOBA, by a well. Trachyte lintel hollowed out to form a trough. At the centre, Greek cross enclosed in a circle. Buried right. H. 33, w. c. 155, th. 73, lett. 4.5 - 7.0. Pl. 41.

οἶκος τῆς cross δεσποίνης
 οἶκος ωσο cross τοκου Μαρτῆς

The underlined letters do not appear on the photograph.

252. KASABA, in the café. Greyish-white marble bearded male figure with hair to shoulders, himation leaving right shoulder bare; in the left hand, fold of himation (or snake?), in the right, patera. Back and sides rough. H. 59, w. 18, th. 19. Pl. P12.

253. KASABA, outside the Belediye. Grey-white marble figure of lion; headquarters and fore-legs broken off. H. 64 plus, length 57 plus, th. 43. On the left shoulder, female figure in low relief, holding circular wreath in raised right hand. Pl. P12.

LYKAONIA

The Ibrala Valley

The Valley of the Ibrala Dere, which rises in the Taurus E of Laranda and finally loses itself in the marshes near Derbe, has been inadequately explored; Sterrett's visit (WE, pp. 14 f.) was short and unproductive, and my own acquaintance with the valley is limited to a day at the village (nahiye) of Ibrala, 27 km. E of Laranda, and at Manazan 5 km. further up the valley towards the east. The valley, though narrow, is a pleasant one, but the country on either side of it is bare and desolate.

At Ibrala, we found no remains of ancient settlement except a church, now used as a mosque. Since this stands in the middle of the modern village, which is a large one, the lack of other remains is not surprising. The whole area between Laranda and Tyana, with the exception of Sidamaria, is very poor in inscriptions, and the absence of surface pottery at Ibrala is explained by the superimposed debris of Turkish settlement and by flooding, which is said to have deposited, within living memory, up to 2 m. of gravel and silt over the immediate area of the church. There is no reason for attributing any particular ancient name to the place, which is hardly likely to have been more than a village; though the name Ibrala (locally pronounced Iprala) may well be of ancient origin.

The Church (pls. 42, P 13); as it stands, the church is of at least two, and probably three, periods, of which only the

first is certainly of Byzantine date. The timber roof, which is very recent, effectively obscures the original exterior outline, and the interior is almost entirely plastered, so that the phases described below are to some extent conjectural.

Period I. To the original building belong the lower parts at least of the outer walls, the inscribed apse flanked by vaulted lateral chambers, the W doorway, the E and S windows, and the niche on the exterior of the N wall. The existing four interior piers may be original, and if they are, their spacing suggests that there was originally a third pier on each side, at the centres of the present N and S dome-arches. This should mean that the church was originally a basilica or "barn-church", but none of the vaults, apart from those of the chambers flanking the apse, is certainly original.

The outer wall was strongly built of large limestone blocks in courses 30 to 50 cm. high. Although the courses do not all run straight through, the whole of the lower part can safely be considered of one build. Most of the upper part of the E wall has been rebuilt, using the original stones, and the N and S walls have been extended upwards to support the eaves of the modern roof. The original walling presumably has a core of mortared rubble, which is now not visible. The E and S windows are double, with central "double-columns" and rough mouldings at the spring of the arches. Of the two, the E window is slightly the more ornate, having a moulded sill, horseshoe arches and a simple arched hood-moulding (pl. P13,E).

The niche in the N wall does not appear to be a blocked window. It is 55 cm. square in elevation and 25 cm. deep, and

has a broad projecting moulding on all four sides (pl.P13,F). Its use is uncertain.

At the E end of the N wall there are signs of a horseshoe arch springing from a projecting moulded corbel (pl.P13,B). The lowest voussoir is in position, while another has been used to block the scarr in the wall caused by the demolition of the arch.

The interior is entirely plastered except for the chambers flanking the apse, which have their original vaults of large, well cut voussoirs (average interior width 35 cm). Each is lit by two small slit windows in the E wall, one low down and one at the level of the vault-spring. The position of these windows, and the presence of two corbels in each of the chambers, suggests that they probably had light wooden floors suspended half-way up the walls, to provide extra storage space. The triangular recesses at the angles of the apse are roofed with stone slabs set just below the spring of the vault. The apse itself is stilted in plan, or of slightly horseshoe form. The small window in the semidome is off-centre and probably secondary.

The roofing of the nave and aisles has certainly been altered at least once and it is doubtful if any of it is original, as the vaults of the present aisles are about 1 m. lower than those of the chambers flanking the apse. The original church was probably a basilica or "barn-church" with four bays^{of} arcading on either side, though the possibility that there was a dome, probably one bay further E than the present one, cannot be excluded. It can hardly have been built later than the sixth or seventh century (see below) and neither the existing square piers nor the flat architraves of the bays to E and W of the

dome-bay correspond with local practice of that date.

Periods II (and III?). The roofing of the nave and aisles, and perhaps that of the apse, appears to be secondary. At present it consists of a modified cross-in-square system, in which the barrel-vaults of the N and S arms of the cross are replaced by semi-domes. The semi-domes are intersected by the otherwise continuous barrel-vaults of the aisles. The result is curious but not unpleasant, but it has an air of being Turkish rather than Byzantine. The flat architraves supporting the bays to E and W of the dome, which span about 180 cm., are very unusual.* Unfortunately, it is impossible to see, under the plaster, what they are made of; it is not unlikely that they are of wood, in which case they may well be Turkish. The dome is said to be of brick, in which case it also is likely to be Turkish, but the drum on which it stands is high enough to have been pierced with windows, which is on the whole a Byzantine feature.

It is probable that at least part of the present roof belongs to a second Byzantine phase. The scheme of roofing as a whole is too obviously that of a church to have been designed entirely by a Turkish church-converter. But there is no means of judging whether this hypothetical later Byzantine church was a cross-in-square of the normal type or a basilica of some kind incorporating a dome. A rough cornice on the exterior of the S side suggests the latter.† The E end of the church at this period seems to have had a separate roof with a shallow pitch down towards the east, the sloping line of which can be seen on both N and S walls, at a higher level than the cornice mentioned above.

* Pl. P13, C.

† Pl. P13, A, D.

A thorough analysis of the building would require the removal of a good deal of plaster, but even an examination of the exterior of the vaults, inside the modern timber roof, might be of some use.

Comment. The original building is of great interest as forming a link between the churches of Lykaonia and those of Byzantine Isauria. The plan of the east end has closer affinities to those of ^{the} Isaurian churches at Alahan, Dağ Pazarı and Cambazlı⁽¹⁾ than to anything on the plateau. In these examples, as at Ibrala, the chambers flanking the apse are accessible both from the aisles and from the chancel, and (except at Dağ Pazarı) the apse does not project at all outside the east wall of the church. Many other churches in Isauria and Pamphylia have similar east ends, except that the side-chambers are accessible only from the aisles; the only church of this more common type in Lykaonia or Cappadocia is at Uluören (pp.259 ff.), which is unusual in many other ways.

My only reason for thinking (p.252) that the original church was of basilical plan is that the span of the dome-bay is equal to twice the span of the E and W bays plus the thickness of a pier. If this conclusion is correct, the present rectangular, almost square, piers are probably formed from columns or the more usual elongated rectangular piers (cf. Apameia, pl.23), with an outer skin of masonry added at a later date⁽²⁾. It is even possible that, like most Isaurian churches, Ibrala was originally roofed partly with timber, though the thickness of the walls makes this improbable.

Ibrala, while geographically part of Lykaonia, lies only

20 km. in a direct line from Dağ Pazarı, the northern^kmost city of early Byzantine Isauria, so that the presence there of strongly Isaurian features in a church can occasion no surprise.

The date of the church at Ibrala is uncertain, but all its recognizable features, such as the plan of the east end, the heavy blocks used both in the walls and in the only certainly original parts of the vaulting, suggest an early date, probably the fifth or sixth century. At the latest, it cannot be later than the seventh.

NOTES

(1) Alahan, main church; P.Verzone, Alahan Monastir, Turin, 1956, pl. 2; A.C.Headlam, Ecclesiastic Sites in Isauria (Hellenic Soc. Suppl. Pap. ii) London 1892, pl. I. Dağ Pazarı; Headlam, op. cit., fig. 10, where the nave is wrongly restored. Cambazlı; MAMA iii, pp. 36 ff., fig. 62.

(2) Occasional examples of basilicas with almost square piers do occur in Asia Minor, e.g. a church at Uzuncaburç (RA, S IV, viii, 1906, p. 34, figs. 26 f.), and at Kaya Sarıncı in Kara Dağ (1001 Churches, pp. 273 f., fig. 233).

LYKAONIA

Dalisandos, Korna and Nea Isaura

The evidence for placing all these was discussed many times over by Ramsay. Dalisandos is by far the most difficult of the three, and I can add nothing to what has already been said (HGAM, pp. 366 f., RE s.v. Dalisandos, Honigmann on Hierocles 710). Korna is somewhat more certain. In Ptolemy it appears as in Lykaonia NE of Laranda and SW of Tyana, in the order of Hierocles as between Isauropolis and Savatra; this diversity of expression is too wide to be of any use in fixing the true position within a day's journey of Kara Dağ. Ramsay (Lycaonia col. 79) abandons Hierocles and locates Korna at Dinorna (SE of Lystra) on the grounds that Ptolemy shows it SSE of Ikonion and SSW of Barata, disregarding the fact that Ptolemy's coordinates for Ikonion are quite out of agreement with those for Lystra, Perta, Savatra and Isaura and that Barata is shown a full degree too far east to correspond with his own location of it at Maden Şehir.

Nea Isaura may be affected by the discovery of Derbe; Strabo (569), puts Derbe on the edge of Isaurike, and this involves the extension of Strabo's Isaurike to include the mountainous country east of Palaia Isaura as far as Laranda, and even further if Strabo's words are to be taken literally. Ramsay's location of Nea Isaura at ^{Dorta} ~~Derbe~~ has been questioned (JHS xlviii, 1928, pp. 220 f.; cf. JHS l, 1930, pp. 269 ff.) and the problem now requires reexamination from scratch. The extension of Isaurike to the east widens the field considerably.

CAPPADOCIA SECUNDA

The South Side of Hasan Dağı

The Peutinger Table's road from Archelais to Tyana (pp. 167 f.), passing through Gideriç, rounded the SW corner of Hasan Dağı just below the Byzantine fortress known as Keçikalesi (1001 Churches, p. 496, fig. 370), beyond which a short, broad valley runs back into the mountain. Within this valley there are today three villages, Çukurkent (or Keçikalesi), Karankapı and Uluören, all ancient sites. At Karankapı, evidence of ancient occupation is limited to some meaningless walls of rough stone on the edge of the modern village, but Çukurkent and Uluören both had churches in a fair state of preservation. One of these three settlements, probably Çukurkent, which is, and probably always was, the most prosperous of the three, must be the Caena of the Peutinger Table, 16 m.p. from Salaberina.

Çukurkent. The church published in 1001 Churches (pp. 382 ff.) still stands in part, though it has suffered much since Miss Bell's visit. On the south side, the foundations have come to light of what appears to have been an aisle corresponding to that on the north, as well as the lower part of a polygonal apse (pl. 43). Miss Bell's description and plan make it clear that the apse which she saw was rounded, and her standards of accuracy were so high that she is very unlikely to have been wrong on this point; the explanation is probably either that the apse was rounded, but stood on a polygonal base, which as a moulded string-course on it shows, originally stood well above ground level,

or that the polygonal apse belonged to an earlier building on the site. The south aisle, however seems to be part of the building as it stood at the time of Miss Bell's visit; her plan shows one jamb of the opening that led from it to the S transept, and she mentions that the "S wall of the nave has fallen and been rebuilt".

Uluören; the church is mentioned in 1001 Churches (p. 301 n) without many details, and does not appear to have been published elsewhere.

It was still standing, in September 1956, a little to the N of a new mosque, then under construction. Any future visitor is likely to find no sign of the church except for stones built into the mosque.

My visit was made in the evening, and it was only several weeks later that I found out that my photographs, taken with inefficient flash apparatus, were an almost complete failure. The survey was complicated by a modern house straddling the outer wall of the N aisle, and by the recent destruction of the W wall and of any narthex that may have lain outside it. Goats were stabled in the remainder of the N aisle, and the chamber to the N of the apse was full to the roof with chaff.

The main features of the design are, however, clear. The church was a basilica or "barn-church", with nine columns on each side, spaced about 2.05 m. between centres (pl. 43). The columns were slightly oval in section (not "double-columns" of the more usual sort), and had rectangular capitals decorated with shallow straps (pl. 43). The arches, each of about seven voussoirs, were of horseshoe form, reaching ^{their} greatest span about

20 cm. above the spring.

The apse had a curious offset at either side (pl. P13, C), up to the level of the spring, which was marked by a projecting moulding. On the N it was flanked by a small chamber having a flat-lintelled door into the aisle and a small window on the E, and roofed with a vault spanning E-W. The vault was of large, well cut stones, and certainly original. The east wall of this chamber was not bonded into the apse but appeared to be contemporary with it, and at the point of junction there was a small triangular recess or niche on the exterior. There was no positive evidence of a similar chamber S of the apse. The exterior facing of the SE corner of the apse was unbroken, but this was to be expected on the analogy of the NE corner. None of the facing of the interior of the apse was preserved.

The roofing of the N aisle was preserved in part. It was markedly inferior to that of the chamber N of the apse, and obviously not original (pl. 43). The ribs were of cut stone, 50 to 70 cm. wide, but the intervening spaces were simply packed with unmortared rubble, laid flush with the ribs on the interior.

None of the vault of the nave had survived, though a single moulded block, lying on top of one of the arches, probably marked the spring. The rough piers of mortared rubble shown on the plan just N of the S arcade must have carried an inner vault of later date, such as is found in Maden Sehir no.1 (1001 Churches, pp. 41 ff., fig. 2) and Eski Andaval (Kleinas.Denk., fig. 3c).

The walls were built of blocks of local pink and grey trachyte, with a core of mortared rubble. The blocks varied

considerably in size, but were accurately fitted. There was some joggling (pl.P12,C). Anathyrosis was used in some places, for instance on the W face of the pilaster at the W end of the S arcade, where it met the W wall. The floor was of stone slabs, up to 150 cm. long and 30 cm. thick.

Comment. Uluören is, as pointed out in 1001 Churches, the only basilica in the area of Hasan Dağı. It probably shares with Ibrala (pp.250ff.) the distinction of being one of the only two churches on the Plateau to have an inscribed apse flanked by side-chambers on the model of the churches on the S coast. The triangular recess at the junction of the apse and the N side-chamber is a distinctive feature of Armenian architecture, at any rate from the end of the 9th century⁽¹⁾. It must, in origin, have been simply a division between projecting polygonal apses, but in Armenia it was often used for merely decorative purposes, as for instance in the cathedral at Ani. While direct Armenian influence at Uluören is of course possible, it can hardly be relied upon sufficiently to form a basis for dating the church. As indications of date, it is worth mentioning that the masonry of the original church, especially the vaulting, is in general solid and good, though not up to the standard of Çukurkent (p.253), and that most of the load is carried by the facing, not by the core. The size of the church, the quality of its original masonry and the fact that it was later partly re-roofed suggest that it was probably built shortly before the Arab wars. But no single one of these three factors is in itself of much value, and as nearly all the evidence for the dating of Central Anatolian churches is based on hypotheses

not susceptible of proof ~~(see pp. ff.)~~ greater accuracy cannot at present be aimed at.

NOTES

(1) There are more than a dozen churches with these niches published in Strzygowski's "Baukunst der Armenier und Europa", of which the earliest appears to be St. Hripsimé at Vagharshapat, dated, according to Strzygowski (op. cit. i, p. ?) to the years immediately following 618. G. Tschubinaschwili, in a short article on "Armenian Art" in Encyclopedia of World Art, i, New York 1959, cols. 716 ff., gives a list of dated 7th century Armenian churches, which does not include St. Hripsimé, and I can only assume that he regards the date as uncertain. Since 1918 when Strzygowski's work was published, so much has been written in Russian and Armenian disproving his conclusions, that anyone not familiar with those languages is dependent on summaries such as Tschubinaschwili's (see his bibliography, loc. cit.). Two churches that he mentions as certainly dated, which have niches of this type, are Shirakavan (last years of 9th century) and Ahtamar (915-921), but the type persists at least into the 13th century.

South Side of Hasan DağıInscriptions

The whole of this area produces very few inscriptions; the following is a representative of the commonest local type of Byzantine epitaph.

254. Çukurkent (Keçikalesi), in a lane. Pink trachyte slab with Greek and Latin crosses incised in panel. The inscription is inverted. H. 166, w. 81, th. 27, letters 2.5 - 4.5. Pl. 41 .

μνήμη Αἰ-
60v175.

264

ABBREVIATIONS

AAES	Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900, New York, 1903-1914.
Antioch.	Antioch-on-the-Orontes. Princeton 1934--.
Armenier.	J.Strzygowski, Baukunst der Armenier und Europa, Vienna 1918.
Aus Lydien.	K.Buresch, Aus Lydien, Leipzig 1898.
Bibliyografiya.	A.M.Mansel, Türkiyenin Arkeoloji Bibliyografiya, Ankara 1948.
BMC	British Museum Catalogues.
Cabrol-Leclercq.	F.Cabrol and H.Leclercq et alii, Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne, Paris 1907.
Catalogue...Constantinople.	G.Mendel, Catalogue des Sculptures Grecques etc., Constantinople, 1912-14.
CB.	W.M.Ramsay, Cities & Bishoprics of Phrygia, Vol.I, pts. i-ii, Oxford 1895-7.
= CERP.	A.H.M.Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, Oxford 1937.
CIG.	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
CIL.	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
Cyzicus	F.W.Hasluck, Cyzicus. Cambridge 1910.
Denkmäler.	H.Swoboda, J.Keil and F.Knoll; Denkmäler aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien und Isaurien, Brunn, 1935.
Dinair-Célènes,	G.Weber, Dinair(Gueïkler), Célènes, Apamée Cibotos, Besançon 1892.
Discoveries.	F.V.J. Arundell, Discoveries in Asia Minor, London 1834.
En Phrygie.	G.Radet, En Phrygie.
Ephesos.	Forschungen in Ephesos, veröffentlicht vom Österreichischen Archaeologischen Institut, Vienna 1906 --.
Epigrammata ex Lap.	Epigrammata ex Lapidibus Collecta (ed.Kaibel)

- ESAR Economic Survey of Ancient Rome (Tenney Frank Ed.) Baltimore, 1933-40.
- FOA H. Kiepert & R. Kiepert; *Forma Orbis Antiqui*, Berlin 1894.
- HGAM W.M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (RGS. Supplementary Papers, 4) London 1890.
- HN (2) B.V. Head, *Historia Numorum*, 2nd Edition, Oxford 1911.
- IGR *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes*.
- Inscr. Bur. *Inscriptiones Bureschianae*, edited by A. Körte, 1902
- IRT J.M. Reynolds and J.B. Ward Perkins, *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, Rome, 1952
- Kleinasien. J. Strzygowski, *Kleinasien, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte*, Leipzig 1903.
- Kleinas. Denkm. H. Rott, *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien* Leipzig 1908.
- Lycaonia. W.M. Ramsay, "Lycaonia", in *Jahreshefte des Öst. Arch. Inst.*, vii, 1904, Beiblatt cols. 57-132.
- MAMA W.H. Buckler, W.M. Calder et alii, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, vols. i-viii, Manchester 1928 --.
- Pamphylien u. Pisidien. K. Lanckoronski et alii, *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens*, Vienna 1890-1892.
- Pergamon. *Altertümer von Pergamon*, Berlin, 1912. --.
- PIR(1) and (2) E. Groag and A. Stein, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, (1st Edition, Berlin 1897-8,) 2nd Edition, Berlin 1933 --.
- PUAES *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria*, 1904-5, 1909.

- RE Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertums=
wissenschaft.
- Reseaches. W.J. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor,
Pontus and Armenia, London 1842.
- Roman Rule. D.Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor, Princeton
1950.
- Sardis. Publications of the American Society for the
Excavation of Sardis.
- SERP Studies in the History and Art of the
Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire
(Aberdeen University Studies, no.20) Aberdeen,
1906.
- Seven Churches. F.V.J.Arundell, A visit to the Seven Churches
of Asia, London 1828.
- Social Basis. Sir W.M.Ramsay, The Social Basis of Roman
Power in Asia Minor, Aberdeen 1941.
- Studies....Buckler. Anatolian Studies presented to W.H.Buckler
(W.M.Calder and J.Keil edd.) Manchester 1939.
- Studies....Ramsay. Anatolian Studies presented to Sir W.M.
Ramsay (W.H.Buckler and W.M.Calder edd.),
Manchester, 1923.
- 1001 Churches. W.M.Ramsay and G.Bell, The Thousand and One
Churches, London 1909.
- = WE J.R.S.Sterrett, The Wolfe Expedition to
Asia Minor (Papers of American School of
Class. Stud. at Athens iii), Boston 1888.

PERIODICALS

- ABSA Annual of the British School at Athens.
- Ann.Ep. Année Epigraphique
- AS Anatolian Studies
- BCH Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
- CR Classical Review
- ILN Illustrated London News

JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
Mon.Piot.	Monuments Piot
RA	Revue Archéologique
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum

